

The *Dialogue of the Monk and Recluse Moschos concerning the Holy Icons*, An Early Iconophile Text

ALEXANDER ALEXAKIS

In this study I discuss in detail a text that has gone unnoticed for many centuries, despite its significance for the history of Iconophile literature. The study is divided into four parts: a brief introduction followed by the *editio princeps* of the text, an English translation with notes and commentary, and a concluding discussion. Since I initially approached the text from a philological point of view, much of the relevant historical information is contained here in the notes to the translation.

The *Dialogue of Moschos* appears to be a record of an actual or a fictitious discussion written as early as the second third of the fifth century A.D. It is clear that this text is a purported dialogue between an orthodox monk and a Sabbatian Christian. Historical, stylistic, and other internal evidence (presented mainly in the notes to the translation) point to a date of composition not far removed from the death of Sabbatios, the founder of the Sabbatian sect (d. after 413). The arguments in the text in favor of or against the veneration of created things are not original. I have attempted to trace them to earlier patristic sources and to place them as accurately as possible among the products of Iconophile intellectual evolution. I have also tried to establish the presence of particular words appearing in the dialogue in other texts earlier than the fifth century. I suggest that, no matter how unoriginal the text's argumentation is, the author must have been the first, or at least one of the first, "pre-Iconophile" believers to put these arguments together in order to formulate a somewhat coherent (though unsophisticated and "primitive") defense of the veneration of created things. Most of these arguments were adopted by the later apologists of the sixth to eighth centuries and were repeated, either partially or in slightly altered form, or further developed in the anti-Jewish dialogues of that period. This study concludes with a reexamination of early iconophobic attitudes among

At Dumbarton Oaks and at Columbia University I had the opportunity to consult with many colleagues apart from those mentioned in the footnotes. I would like to thank Vincent Déroche, Cyril Mango, the late Alexander Kazhdan, Alice-Mary Talbot, Henry Maguire, David Olster, Theodora Antonopoulou, Lee F. Sherry, Peter Hatlie, Margaret Mullett, Claudia Rapp, and an anonymous reader. I also wish to thank Roger Bagnall, Alan Cameron, James Rives, and Elizabeth Castelli of the "Late Antique Society" at Columbia University. Thanks are also due to Frances Kianka, Leslie MacCoull, and Olga Grushin for their editing and proofreading, and to Victoria Erhart and Mark Zapatka of the Byzantine Library. It goes without saying that I owe much to their erudition, but I alone am responsible for any mistakes and inaccuracies.

Christians, especially among Sabbatians and Novatians, and a comparison of the *Dialogue of Moschos* to later Iconophile literature.

Note that I use the terms *Iconophile(s)*, *iconophoby*, and other related words in a somewhat broader sense than usual. These terms became prominent during the eighth century, when the discussion focused on image veneration. However, in the early period the debate moved along traditionally Old Testament lines and touched on the prohibition against the veneration of created things in general and not only icons. One should therefore bear in mind that by these terms I usually refer to all types of veneration of created things. Note also the use of square brackets in two distinct contexts: in the critical edition of the text they indicate a sequestered word or words; in the translation they are used to denote insertion of additional words.

I. INTRODUCTION

Codex Parisinus graecus 1115 (P), copied by Leo Kinnamos in 1276 from a manuscript of the papal library in Rome that dated to 774/5,¹ preserves on fols. 278–80 a fragment from a seemingly much more extensive dialogue between an orthodox Christian named Moschos and an unspecified heretic. This fragment is not known from any other manuscript source and occupies a place toward the end of an enormous Iconophile florilegium that covers folios 235v–283v of P. No scholar has ever paid attention to this work apart from J. Gouillard, who described the dialogue as a text “d’une rare platitude.”² On another occasion, Gouillard suggested that the author of the dialogue had “pillaged” a letter written by Pope Gregory II to Patriarch Germanus I ca. 730.³ This implied that the dialogue was a work of the Iconoclast period and, more specifically, of the second Iconoclasm.⁴ As we shall see, this is not the case.

The manuscript in which the text is found preserves a fragment full of Old Testament quotations, including at least one Talmudic reference, that mainly deal with the prohibition against venerating manmade objects. It is evident, however, that the original compiler of the Iconophile florilegium did not merely extract the appropriate fragments from the dialogue, but included in his excerpt some parts that are not relevant to the subject. So the discussion on image veneration is preceded by two or three sentences informing us that the heretical opponent of Moschos does not accept the repentance of lapsed Christians (lines 3–5 of the text below). In addition, the fragment ends with a

¹For this manuscript see J. Munitiz, “Le Parisinus Graecus 1115: Description et arrière-plan historique,” *Scriptorium* 36 (1982), 51–67, who has questioned the validity of the information contained in the colophon of P. The same opinion has also been supported by K.-H. Uthemann, “Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Union des Konzils von Lyon (1274): Bemerkungen zum Codex Parisinus gr. 1115 (Med. Reg. 2951),” *AnnHistCon* 13 (1981), 27–49. For the dating given here, see A. Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115 and Its Archetype*, DOS 34 (Washington, D.C., 1996), 254–55.

²J. Gouillard, “L’hérésie dans l’Empire byzantin des origines au XII^e siècle,” *TM* 1 (1965), 311.

³J. Gouillard, “Aux origines de l’iconoclasm: Le témoignage de Grégoire II?” *TM* 3 (1968), 244. It is interesting that this letter is also transmitted by P on fols. 281v–283v, and the fragment from the dialogue is found on fol. 283.

⁴The occurrence of the name Sabbatios in the text has decidedly contributed to that assumption (see lines 123, 124, and 127, where the two opponents speak about the *relic* of Sabbatios). Sabbatios has been identified with a monk of that name who in 813 advised Leo V the Armenian to restore Iconoclasm (see Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed., 27–28).

vague allusion by Moschos to the relics of a certain Sabbatios that have never produced any cure; to this the heretic retorts that Moschos' statement cannot be proven. The fragment ends abruptly with Moschos' claim that he can offer information on the issue.

It is impossible to establish the author, date, or place of origin of this fragment, but in many aspects the work resembles the dialogues between Christians and Jews that first appear in the seventh century.⁵ It might be even earlier because, as will become evident, both parties support their arguments exclusively on the basis of Holy Scripture. The text contains no references to patristic literature on the veneration of manmade objects, despite the fact that this is a "dialogue" between Christians.

⁵See V. Déroche, "La polémique antijudaïque au VI^e et au VII^e s.: Un memento inédit, les Képhalaia," *TM* 11 (1991), 275–311.

II. TEXT

Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115

- (fol. 278) Διάλογος Μόσχου μοναχοῦ καὶ ἐγκλείστου πρὸς τινὰ περὶ εἰκόνων ἁγίων. Μετὰ πολλὴν δὲ τὴν διάλεξιν, ἔφη πρὸς ὃν διελέγετο ὁ εἰρημένος μοναχός· “Ἦκουσας τί γράφει ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ βεβαπτισμένῃ· πῶς οὖν σὺ τὴν μετανοίαν οὐ δέχῃ, ἣν ὁ Κύριος προσδέχεται; Ταύτην οὖν μὴ δεχομένου σου οὐδὲν ἄλλο φαίνει ἢ ἀντινομοθετῶν τῷ Χριστῷ.” Αὐτὸς δὲ ἔφη· “Ὑμῶν κατηγορεῖ Σολομὼν περὶ ὧν δοκεῖτε¹ προσκυνεῖν εἰκόνων καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν· λέγει γὰρ οὗτος· ‘ξύλον σκολιὸν καὶ ὄξοις² συμπεφυκὸς <λαβὼν> ἔγλυψεν³ ἐν ἐπιμελείᾳ <ἀργίας> αὐτοῦ· . . . ἀπείκασεν³ αὐτὸ εἰκόνι ἀνθρώπου ἢ ζῶντι <εὐτελεῖ> ὁμοίωσεν³ αὐτὸ καταχρίσας⁴ [αὐτὸ] μίλτω καὶ φύκει⁵ ἐρυθρήνας⁶ χροῖαν αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσαν κηλίδα⁷ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ καταχρί⁸ [ῶ]σας⁹ καὶ ποιήσας⁹ αὐτῷ <αὐτοῦ> ἄξιον οἶκημα, ἔθηκεν³ αὐτὸ¹⁰ ἐν τοίχῳ ἀσφαλίσάμενος¹¹ σιδήρῳ. ἵνα <μὲν οὖν> μὴ καταπέσῃ προενόησεν³ [γὰρ] αὐτοῦ εἰδὼς¹² ὅτι ἀδυνατεῖ ἐαυτῷ βοηθῆσαι· καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν καὶ χρεῖαν ἔχει βοηθείας. περὶ δὲ κτημάτων αὐτοῦ¹³ καὶ γάμων καὶ τέκνων προσευχόμενος¹¹ οὐκ αἰσχύνεται¹⁴ τῷ ἀψύχῳ προσλαλῶν¹⁵ . . . [καὶ] περὶ <δὲ> ζωῆς τὸ νεκρὸν ἀξιοῖ.’¹⁶ Πῶς οὖν εἰκόνι ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε, τοιαῦτα ἀκούοντες παρὰ Σολομῶντος, καὶ πάλιν λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ‘μὴ προσκυνήσῃς παντὶ χειροποιήτῳ [ἐπι] (fol. 278v) ἐπικατάρατον γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτό;’” Ὁ ὀρθόδοξος ἔφη· “Αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπὴν ἐνεδύσω ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ νῦν δὲ ἐντρέψει σε ὁ Σολομὼν. Περὶ ὧν εἶπας ῥημάτων, αὐτῶν καὶ ἀκούσεις καὶ σύ. Πλανᾶσαι¹⁷ μὴ εἰδὼς τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν· οὐ χρὴ γὰρ μόνον τὰ γράμματα ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν γραφῶν τὴν δύναμιν γινώσκειν. Δοκιμάσωμεν οὖν τὰ ῥήματα καὶ μάθωμεν παρ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σολομῶντος περὶ τίνων λέγει τὰῦτα καὶ τίνοι ἀρμόζουσιν καὶ εἰ ὡς γεγονότα ἔλεγε καὶ εἰ γεγόνασι, τίνες ἐποίησαν· λέγει γάρ· ‘Ταλαίπωροι <δὲ> καὶ <ἐν νεκροῖς> αἱ ἐλπίδες αὐτῶν, οἵτινες ἐκάλεσαν θεοὺς ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων, χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον τέχνης ἐμμελέτημα καὶ ἀπεικασματα ζῶν.’¹⁸ Ἦκουσας τί εἶπε· μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἀπὸ χρυσοῦ ἢ ἀργύρου ἐχάλκευσα ζῶν, τουτέστι μόνον ἐν Χωρῇ καὶ προσεκύνησα αὐτό; Εἶτα πάλιν λέγει Σολομὼν· ‘τὸ δὲ χειροποίητον ἐπικατάρατον [καὶ] αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτό, ὅτι ὁ μὲν εἰργάζετο, τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν <Θεός> ὠνομάσθη· ἐν ἴσῳ γὰρ μισητὰ Θεῷ καὶ ὁ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἡ ἀσέβεια αὐτοῦ . . .’¹⁹ Ἀρχὴ γὰρ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων.’ Εἰπὲ οὖν, τίς ἐπόρνευσε τοῖς εἰδώλοις· μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπόρνευσα καὶ ἐτελέσθη<ν> τῷ Βεελφεγῶρ,

3f cf. Col. 1.12–14 || 6f Wisd. of Sol. 13.13–18 || 15f Wisd. of Sol. 14.8 || 17 Ps. 34.26.2 || 19 cf. Matt. 22.29 || 20f cf. Acts 8.30 || 23f Wisd. of Sol. 13.10 || 26f cf. Exod. 32.4 || 27f Wisd. of Sol. 14.8–9/12 || 30 cf. Num. 25.3/Ps. 105.28

¹cod.: δοκεῖται || ²cod.: ὄξοις || ³cod.:—αν || ⁴cod.: καταχρώσαντες || ⁵cod.: φυκὶ || ⁶cod.: ἐρυθράναντες || ⁷cod.: κλεῖδα || ⁸i supra lineam || ⁹cod.:—σαντες || ¹⁰cod.: αὐτῷ || ¹¹cod.:—μενοι || ¹²cod.: εἰδότες || ¹³cod.: αὐτῶν || ¹⁴cod.:—ονται || ¹⁵cod.:—οὔντες || ¹⁶cod.: τῶν νεκρῶν ἀξιούντες || ¹⁷cod.: πλανᾶσε || ¹⁸cod.: ἀπείκασμα ζώου || ¹⁹ἐν ἴσῳ—αὐτοῦ cod.: ἐν ὅσῳ γὰρ μισεῖ τὰ θεῷ ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἡ ἀσέβεια αὐτῶν

- τῷ εἰδῶλι; Μὴ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἔπρασσαν εἰκοσιτρεῖς χιλιάδες ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ; Μὴ γὰρ Φι-
νεὲς με ἐξιλάσατο ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς; Εἴτα λοιπὸν ἄκουσον καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ Σολομῶντος· 'οὐκ
ἤρκεσεν²⁰ τὸ πλανᾶσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ ζῶντες πολέμῳ
ἀγνοίας, τοσαῦτα κακὰ εἰρήνην προσαγορεύουσιν, ἥ²¹ γὰρ τεκνοφόνους τελετὰς
35 ἢ κρύφια μυστήρια' ἐτέλουν. Λέγε οὖν μοι, τίς ἐποίησε τεκνοφόνους τελετὰς; Μὴ γὰρ
ἐγὼ ἔθυσσα τοὺς υἱοὺς μου καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας μου τοῖς δαιμονίοις; Μὴ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ
ἐφονοκτονήθη ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς αἵμασι; Μὴ ἐγὼ εἰκόνα ἔστησα εἰς τὸν ναὸν τετράμορφον
ἔχουσαν εἰδῶλον καὶ αὐτὴν προσεκύνουν; Μὴ βδελύγματα ἐρπετῶν καὶ κτηνῶν ἐπὶ τῷ
τοίχῳ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐγὼ ἔγραψα; Μὴ γὰρ ἐμὲ εἶδεν Ἰεζεκιὴλ ὁ προφήτης θρηνοῦντα
40 τὸν Ἀδονὶ καὶ θυμιῶντα τῷ ἡλίῳ, περὶ ᾧ λέγει καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος· 'ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ
κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα;' Μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἔστησα εἰκόνας τῶν δύο πορνῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ,
τῆς Ὁολα²² καὶ τῆς Ὀόλιβα,²³ καὶ προσεκύνησα αὐταῖς; Μὴ ἐγὼ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι τῷ Βῆλ
προσεκύνησα; Μὴ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ τῷ Δαγῶν ἔθυσσα; Ταῦτα ἐκείνοις τοῖς ποιή-
σασιν ἐγκαλεῖ· ταῦτα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις λέγει, περὶ ᾧ καὶ ἡ γραφὴ μεγαλοφῶνως βοᾷ·
45 ποῦ γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ Σολομῶντος ἡ Χριστιανῶν ἐκκλησία; Οὐδὲ μετὰ χίλια ἔτη ἀνέστη ἀφ'
οὗ ταῦτα γέγονε καὶ ἐλέχθη. Πῶς οὖν ταῦτα τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγκαλεῖς ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ
μηδέποτε εἰδῶλοις τελεσθεῖσῃ ἢ τεκνο(fol. 279)φονίαις ἢ κνίσαις²⁴ ἢ μυστηρίοις μιαρ-
οῖς ἢ τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα σεβασθεῖσῃ ἢ προσκυνησάσῃ; Πλὴν οὐδέποτε οἱ
αἵρετικοὶ συνιοῦσι τῶν γραφῶν τὰ ιδιώματα. Οὐχὶ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία μετὰ το-
50 σαῦτα ἔτη ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως εὗρεν ἐν τῇ δρυϊ τῇ Μαμβρῇ [lacuna] τὰ
ξόανα τοῦ ματαίου Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τὸν πάνυ βοῶμενον παρ' Ἑλλησι Πανυσανίου²⁵
τοῦ Λακεδαιμόνων²⁶ βασιλέως τὸν τρίποδα <καὶ> κατέλυσεν αὐτοῦς²⁷ καὶ ἐκκλησίαν
Χριστοῦ, ἥτοι ναόν, ᾠκοδόμησεν; Οὐχὶ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὸν ναὸν κατεπάτησε
καὶ ἠδάφισε καὶ τοῦ Ἀδονὶ τὸ εἰδῶλον ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ ἐβύθισεν; Οὐχὶ ἐν Δάφνῃ τῆς
55 Συρίας τὸ περικαλλὲς αὐτῶν μάταιον ἄγαλμα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος κατέκαυσεν²⁸ ἢ αὐτὴ
τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία καὶ Βαβυλᾶ τοῦ μάρτυρος τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ λειψάνων θήκην
ἀνέδειξεν; Ἐκεῖνοις οὖν περὶ τούτων ἐγκαλεῖ Σολομῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τοῦτου πατὴρ
Δαυὶδ, λέγων· 'τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον, ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων,
στόμα ἔχουσι<v> καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσιν, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσι<v> καὶ οὐκ ὄψονται, ὥτα ἔ-
60 χουσι<v> καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσονται, ῥίνας ἔχουσι<v> καὶ οὐκ ὀσφρανθήσονται, χεῖρας ἔ-
χουσι<v> καὶ οὐ ψηλαφήσουσι, πόδας ἔχουσι<v> καὶ οὐ περιπατήσουσιν, οὐ φωνήσου-
σιν ἐν τῷ λάρυγγι αὐτῶν. ὅμοιοι αὐτῶν γένοιντο οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ
πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.' Τῇ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ Σολομῶν ἐβόα· 'εὐλόγηται²⁹ <γὰρ>
ξύλον δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη.' Δῆλον ὅτι τὸν ἅγιον σταυρὸν λέγει.
65 Καὶ πάλιν Δαυὶδ λέγει τῇ αὐτῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ· 'ὑποῦτε κύριον τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν

31 cf. Num. 25.9/25.11–13/Ps. 105.30 || 32f Wisd. of Sol. 14.22–23 || 36f Ps. 105.37 || 37 Ps. 105.38.4 || 38 Ez. 8.10 || 39f cf. Ez. 8.14/8.11 || 40f Rom. 1.25 || 41f cf. Ez. 23.4f || 42 cf. 2 Kings 17.16/Jer. 39.28–29 || 43f cf. Judg. 16.23 || 58f Ps. 113.12–16 || 63f Wisd. of Sol. 14.7 || 65f Ps. 98.5

²⁰cod.: ἤρκεσαν || ²¹cod.: εἰ || ²²cod.: τῆς οδοῦ || ²³cod.: τῆς ολίβα || ²⁴cod.: κρίσαις || ²⁵cod.: –αν ||

²⁶cod.: λακαιδεμόνων || ²⁷sic, an αὐτά? || ²⁸cod.: κατέπαυσεν || ²⁹cod.: εὐλογεῖτε

- καὶ προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἅγιός ἐστιν.’ Ἀποκρίθητι οὖν μοι· οὐχὶ ξύλον ἐστὶν ὁ σταυρός, οὐ χειροποίητον κατασκεύασμα; Ἀλλὰ βλέπε τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τανυθέντος Χριστοῦ· δαίμονας γὰρ φυγαδεύει, νόσους ἰᾶται, ζωὴν δίδωσι. Περὶ τούτου τοῦ ξύλου βοᾷ Σολομών, ὡς προείπομεν, ἐυλόγηται^{29a}
- 70 ξύλον δι’ οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη,’ καὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ· ‘προσκυνήσωμεν εἰς τὸν τόπον, οὗ ἔστησαν οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ.’ Τίني πεισθῶ· σοί, ἢ τῷ Δαυὶδ καὶ Σολομώντι; Ἐκεῖνοι λέγουσι ‘προσκυνήσωμεν,’ σὺ λέγεις ‘μὴ προσκυνήσης.’ Εἰπὲ οὖν, πῶς προσκυνεῖς τῇ κοινωνίᾳ σου καὶ τῷ μεγαλείῳ σου—καὶ ταῦτα χειροποίητα κατασκευάσματα—καὶ ταῦτα πῶς προσκυνεῖς; Ὁ γὰρ ἂν εἶπης, ἐπὶ σοῦ καὶ ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ νοήσεις. Εἰ μὲν ὡς
- 75 χειροποίητα προσκυνήσεις, περιπίπτεις εἰς τὸ ῥῆμα Σολομώντος καὶ Δαυὶδ· ‘ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ προσκυνῶν χειροποιήτοις’ καὶ ἅπερ δοκεῖς³⁰ ἄλλοις μέμφεσθαι εἰς αὐτὰ περιέπεσας.’ Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, εἶπεν· “Οὐ προσκυνῶ χειροποιήτοις ποτέ, ἀλλ’ ἅπερ (fol. 279v) οἶδα δύναμιν ἔχοντα θεϊκὴν.” Ὁ ὀρθόδοξος ἔφη· “Εἰ ὡς δύναμιν ἔχοντα θεϊκὴν προσκυνεῖς καὶ ὡς ἅγια ἔχεις καὶ τιμᾶς, τί ἐμοὶ μέμφη καὶ λοιδορεῖς
- 80 οὕτω με προσκυνοῦντα; Ἡμεῖς γὰρ προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν . . . οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταί, οἱ πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνοῦντες, προστρέχοντες τῇ ἀγίᾳ κοινωνίᾳ ὡς σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναδειχθείση³¹ καὶ ζωὴν χαριζομένη τοῖς πιστεύουσι· προσκυνοῦμεν τὰ ἄχραντα μεγαλεῖα, ὡς ἄχραντα λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ· προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων οὐ ψιλῶ ξύλῳ ἢ ὡς χειροποίητον, ἀλλὰ τοῦ τιμηθέντος καὶ
- 85 δοξασθέντος παρὰ Θεῷ τὸν περιεχόμενον ἐκεῖσε χαρακτῆρα· δούλου γὰρ τοῦ δοξασθέντος καὶ προσκυνουμένου, προσκυνεῖται³² καὶ ὁ δοξάσας αὐτὸν Θεός. Ἐκεῖνους οὖν προσκυνῶ περὶ ὧν Σολομών λέγει· ‘Δικαίων <δὲ> ψυχαὶ ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ ἄφηται αὐτῶν βάσανος. ἔδοξαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀφρόνων τεθνάναι καὶ ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἢ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἀφ’ ἡμῶν πορεία σύντριμμα, οἱ δὲ εἰσιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ. . . ὀλίγα
- 90 [γὰρ] παιδευθέντες, μεγάλα εὐεργετηθήσονται, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐπέειράσεν³³ αὐτοὺς καὶ εὗρεν αὐτοὺς ἀξίους ἑαυτοῦ· ὡς χρυσὸν ἐν χωνευτηρίῳ ἐδοκίμασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ὡς ὀλοκάρπωμα³⁴ θυσίας προσεδέξατο αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν³⁵ ἀναλάμψουσι<ν>. . . κρινοῦσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσι<ν> λαῶν καὶ βασιλεύσει αὐτῶν κύριος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.’ Καὶ πάλιν· ‘οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ’ αὐτὸν συνήσουσιν³⁶ ἀλήθειαν
- 95 καὶ οἱ πιστοὶ³⁷ ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ· ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς³⁸ αὐτοῦ.’ Καὶ πάλιν ὁ προφήτης Ἡσαΐας φησί· ‘Μακάριοι πάντες οἱ ὑπομένοντες αὐτόν.’ Καὶ Δαυὶδ περὶ αὐτῶν φησι· ‘τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτοῦ ἐθανυμάστωσεν ὁ Κύριος πάντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτοῖς.’ Καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· ‘οὐ μὴ συναγάγω τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν ἐξ αἱμάτων.’ Καὶ πάλιν· ‘θαυμαστός ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς
- 100 Ἰσραὴλ.’ Καὶ ἐτέρωθι· ‘ἐμοὶ δὲ λίαν ἐτιμήθησαν οἱ φίλοι σου, ὁ Θεός· λίαν ἐκραταιώθησαν αἱ ἀρχαὶ αὐτῶν· ἐξαριθμήσομαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄμμον πληθυνθήσονται.’ Ὁ δὲ προφήτης Ζαχαρίας³⁹ φησὶν· ‘Ἦξει <κύριος> ὁ Θεός <μου> καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι

70f Ps. 131.7 || 80f John 4.22/23 || 87f Wisd. of Sol. 3.1–3/5–8 || 94f Wisd. of Sol. 3.9 || 96 Isa. 30.18 (μακάριοι οἱ ἐμμένοντες ἐν αὐτῷ) || 97f Ps. 15.3/4 || 99f Ps. 67.36 || 100f Ps. 138.17–18 || 102f Zach. 14.5

^{29a}cod.: εὐλογεῖτε || ³⁰cod.: δοκοῖς || ³¹cod.:—σα || ³²cod.:—τε || ³³cod.:—ζεν || ³⁴cod.: ὀλοκαύτωμα || ³⁵cod.: αὐτοῦ || ³⁶cod.: εὐριοῦσιν || ³⁷cod.: δίκαιοι || ³⁸cod.: ὁσίοις || ³⁹cod.: Ἡσαΐας

- [αὐτοῦ] μετ' αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, εἰ πάντα παραγάγω τὰ ἐκ τῆς θείας γραφῆς περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰρημένα ἐπιλείπει με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος. Τούτων τῶν ἁγίων τοὺς
- 105 χαρακτήρας τυπομένους ἐν εἰκόσι προσκυνεῖ καὶ τιμᾷ ἢ καθολικῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, μεγαλύνουσα αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἄθλους, τὴν τε νηστείαν καὶ ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ εὐποιῖαν καὶ πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν ἐξαγγέλλουσα διὰ τε γραφικῆς διηγήσεως καὶ ἱστορικῆς ὑποθέσεως, (fol. 280) ἵνα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος Δαυίδ· ὅπως ἂν γνῶ γενεὰ ἑτέρα, υἱοὶ <οἱ> τεχθησόμενοι, καὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ ἀπαγγελοῦσιν⁴⁰ αὐτὰ τοῖς υἱοῖς <αὐτῶν>, ἵνα θῶνται ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῶν. Καὶ πᾶς τοίνυν πιστὸς δι' ἐγγράφου ἐξηγήσεως καὶ τῆς ἱστορικῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων, ὡς εἴρηται, τοὺς τε ἀγῶνας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῶν χαρακτήρων αὐτῶν, διεγείρεται εἰς ἀνδρείαν καὶ ζῆλον καὶ πόθον καὶ κατάνυξιν καὶ δυσωπεῖ τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν⁴¹ τῆς αὐτῆς κλήσεως καὶ μερίδος καὶ
- 115 σωτηρίας τυχεῖν, βλέπων μάλιστα διὰ τῶν λειψάνων αὐτῶν καὶ χαρακτήρων θαυματουργίας ἰάσεων γινομένης. Διὸ πίστει καὶ πόθῳ προσερχόμενος καὶ ἀσπαζόμενος αὐτούς, ἁγιάζομαι διὰ τῆς ἐν ἐμοὶ πίστεως, ἧς ἔχω πρὸς τὸν τιμήσαντα αὐτοὺς Θεόν, δι' ὃν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐξέχεαν, μὴ προσκυνήσαντες τοῖς δαιμονικοῖς εἰδώλοις τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Σὺ δὲ πλανώμενος, μὴ εἰδὼς τὰς γραφάς, τὴν αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπὴν καὶ τὸ
- 120 ὄνειδος, ὅπερ ἐγράφη τοῖς Ἑλλήσι καταχέειν τῇ πεφωτισμένῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ, κατὰ τὸν σὸν σκοπὸν ἐπανάγεις. Γίνωσκε ὡς ὑπεύθυνος ἔση τῷ φοβερῷ κριτηρίῳ σὺν πάσῃ τῇ προσοῦσῃ σοι δυσσεβείᾳ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους αὐτοῦ βλασφημίας. Δός μοι δὲ τὴν σὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπελάσασάν ποτε δαίμονας· δός μοι τὰ λείψανα Σαββατίου, οὗ σέβῃ, ὅτι παθῶν κατεκράτησαν ἢ νόσους ἰάσαντο. Ἄλλ' οὔτε αὐτὸς Σαββάτιος ἐλυτρώσατό σε ἐκ τῆς σῆς πατρώας πλάνης.” Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ αἵρετικὸς ἔφη·
- 125 “Ἴδου περὶ Σολομῶντος ἀπέδειξας περὶ τίνων λέγει τὸ μὴ προσκυνεῖν· ἀποδέχομαι. Περὶ δὲ Σαββατίου ἀναπόδεικτον πρᾶγμα μὴ προσενέγκης.” Ὁ δὲ ἔφη· “Εγὼ σε καὶ περὶ τούτων πληροφορῶ . . .”

104 Heb. 11.32 || 109 cf. John 12.38 || 109f Ps. 77.6–7

⁴⁰cod.: ἀνα– || ⁴¹cod.: αὐτῶν

III. TRANSLATION

Dialogue between Moschos, Monk and Recluse,⁶ and [an anonymous interlocutor]
concerning the Holy Icons⁷

After much discussion, the aforementioned monk said to [the man] with whom he was talking: “You have heard what the apostle Paul wrote to the baptized Church; therefore, how is it that you do not accept the repentance that the Lord accepts? If you refuse to accept it, you appear to be doing nothing but legislating in opposition to Christ.”⁸

And he responded: “Solomon accuses you for what you seem to be worshiping, [that is], images/icons and other things; for he says: *A crooked piece of wood and full of knots <he took and> carveth it with the diligence of his idleness . . . he giveth it the semblance of the image of a man, or maketh it like some paltry animal, smearing it with vermilion, and with paint coloring it red, and smearing every stain that is therein; And having made for it a chamber worthy of it, he setteth it in a wall, and maketh it fast with iron. In order therefore that it may not fall, he taketh thought for it; knowing that it is unable to help itself; (for verily it is an image, and hath need of help;) and when he maketh his prayer for his goods and for his marriage and children, he is not ashamed to speak to that which hath no life; . . . and for life he beseecheth that which is dead.*”⁹ How is it, then, that you

⁶The name Μόσχος is not widely attested; apart from the famous author of the *Pratum spirituale*, we do not know of many other monks by that name. The Μόσχος of the dialogue cannot be identified.

For the monastic practice of *enkleismos* (“seclusion” or “enclosure”), attested from the 4th century, see *ODB* I:699–700; see also I. Peña, P. Castellana, and R. Fernandez, *Les reclus syriens* (Milan, 1980) and the relevant entry (*reclus*) in *DACL* 14.2:2149–59 by H. Leclercq. Already by the 5th century *enkleistoi* were to be found throughout the late Roman Empire, from Egypt to Constantinople to the West (*DACL* 14.2:2152).

⁷Apparently this title and part of the opening line cannot be original: the fragment does not deal exclusively with “holy icons,” and the entire dialogue touches upon other issues as well. The first words of the dialogue also seem to be an addition by the hand of the person who excerpted the original text. These words make the abrupt beginning of the text a little less awkward.

⁸These lines give the first basic point of dissent between the two discussants: the rejection on the part of Moschos’ opponent of the repentance of lapsed Christians. This allows for an initial narrowing of the possibilities concerning the confessional identity of Moschos’ opponent. It is generally known that in the early Church one sect, the Novatians or *Katharoi*, had been notorious for refusing to readmit the *lapsi* of the persecutions of Decius (A.D. 250–251) and for its strict attitude toward any sin committed after baptism. See Epiphanius, *Panarion*, II, 363.13–364.4; Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:537A–541A; H. J. Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum: Der Kirchenbegriff des Novatian und die Geschichte seiner Sonderkirche*, Theophaneia 20 (Bonn, 1968), 57–83, 115–21, 139–68; T. E. Gregory, “Novatianism: A Rigorist Sect in the Christian Roman Empire,” *ByzSt* 2.1 (1975), 2–4. The Sabbatians, an offshoot of the Novatians, held the same rigorist views. See Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:621A–625A, 745B–748A, 757C–760C; Sozomen, *HE*, 327.8–329.8, 348.9–349.20; Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum*, 245–48; Gregory, “Novatianism,” 13ff. On the issue of repentance these two sects appear together in the following passage from the *De Trinitate* I, attributed to Didymus the Blind: Πρὸς τοῦτοις ἔλαβεν ἑξουσίαν (i.e., Peter the Apostle), μάλλον δὲ καὶ πάντες δι’ αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀπαγορεύειν τοῖς παῖουσιν, ἀλλὰ δέχεσθαι μετανοοῦντας. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀναμάρτητος, εἰ μὴ ὁ αὐτὴν ἐπιτρέψας τῷ Πέτρῳ τὴν αὐθεντείαν, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν “ὁ ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.” ἔρριπεν ἔκτοτε τὴν Ναύατου καὶ Σαββατίου ἀπανθρωπίαν. (Hönscheid, *Didymus*, 204.17–206.19; the work dates from the period 397–398 [ibid., 5] and offers the earliest written attestation of Sabbatians [ibid., 207 n. 2]. See also Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum*, 247). Concerning the New Testament passage presented by Moschos in order to refute the thesis of his opponent, I have proposed Col. 1.12–14, but one cannot be sure of the contents of the missing part of the dialogue. There are a number of relevant biblical passages cited in chap. 30 of the *De Trinitate* I, but Col. 1.12–14 seems to be the most appropriate (cf. Hönscheid, *Didymus*, 204.18–206.23).

⁹This is a very unusual passage for a non-Iconophile to use in beginning a disputation on the subject of image worship. The issue crops up in some dialogues between Christians and Jews or between Christians

worship an image, although you have heard such words from Solomon and [although] again he says: “Thou shalt not worship any idol made with hands, for it is *accursed, itself and he that made it*”?¹⁰

The orthodox said: “On the issue of repentance you have been *clothed with shame and dishonor* by the apostles, and now Solomon is going to embarrass you. For you are going to hear about the very same words that you mentioned.

“*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor their power*; for it is necessary not only to read the letters, but also to understand the meaning of the Scriptures. Let us test, therefore, the words and let us learn from Solomon himself what he said these [words] about, and to whom these [words] apply, and if he spoke them of events that did occur, and if [what Solomon spoke about] has happened, who were the agents; for he says: ‘*But miserable were they, and in dead things were their hopes, who called them gods which are works of men’s hands, gold and silver, wrought with careful art, and likenesses of beasts.*’¹¹ You heard what he said; it was certainly not me who forged gold or silver into a beast, that is, the calf on Mount Horeb, and worshiped it.

“Then again said Solomon: ‘*But the idol made with hands is accursed, itself and he that made it; because his was the working, and the corruptible thing was named a god; for both the ungodly doer and his ungodliness are alike hateful to God. . . . For the devising of idols was the beginning of fornication.*’ Say, then, who prostituted himself to the idols?¹² Did I prostitute myself and did I join myself unto Baalpeor,¹³ the idol? Did twenty-three thousand fall by my hand in a single day?¹⁴ Did Phinehas make an atonement of [God’s] wrath for me? Then, finally, listen to the rest of Solomon’s [words]: ‘. . . *it was not enough for them to go astray in the*

and pagans and develops into a theological problem proper during Iconoclasm (for image worship—or, in general, worshiping manmade objects—in anti-Jewish literature, see V. Déroche, “L’authenticité de l’Apologie contre les Juifs” de Léontios de Neapolis,” *BCH* 110 [1986], 661–64, and idem, in Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 99–104). What one usually finds in this literature when the subject is introduced is a general reference to the scriptural prohibition of venerating objects made by human hands, basically Exod. 20.4, Lev. 26.1, Deut. 5.8 (cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *Questiones ad Antiochum*, PG 28:621A–D; Ἀντιβολή, 33; Διάλεξις Ἰουδαίου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, Mansi XIII, 165E; Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*, PG 89:1233C; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 68.93–94; Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*, 52.17–18; the Syriac *Disputation of Sergius*, X.2, XVI.3, etc.). An interesting exception can be found in Τρόπαια, 245, where the subject is presented with a quotation from Isa. 44.17. I have been able to trace the passage in question in two later works, the first, in chronological order, being the *Sermo VIII* of Symeon Stylites the Younger in a passage where Symeon inveighs against the pagans (see H. G. Thümmel, *Die Frühgeschichte der ostkirchlichen Bilderlehre*, TU 139 [Berlin, 1992], 322). There follows the mid-8th-century Νουθεσία, 166, where it is employed by the Iconoclast bishop Cosmas.

¹⁰The first part of this quotation is not attested by any other source. In any case, the entire passage presents the same situation as the one examined in the previous note: it appears only in the Νουθεσία, 166, next to the previous quotation.

¹¹Cf. Νουθεσία, 166.

¹²From what follows one can deduce that here Moschos refers to Num. 25.1f and has slightly changed part of the biblical quotation in order to connect it with what he has already said. In the biblical passage the word ἐκπορνεύω (which became πορνεύω in Moschos’ mouth) is used to show that the Israelites first *began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab* and then worshiped Baalpeor.

¹³Cf. Ἀντιβολή, 77.3–4; Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*, PG 89:1236CD; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 68.76–80, 70.167–70. Similar lists of acts of idolatry also occur in John Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos orationes VIII*, PG 48:906, line 20f and in the 3rd-century *Martyrium Pionii*, ed. L. Robert, *Le Martyre de Pionios prêtre de Smyrne* (Washington, D.C., 1994), 22.

¹⁴The number of Israelites killed in Num. 25.9 was actually twenty-four thousand.

knowledge of God, but also, while they live in sore conflict through ignorance . . . that multitude of evils they call peace, for they either slaughtered children in solemn rites, or celebrated secret mysteries.¹⁵

“Say, then, who slaughtered children in solemn rites? Did I sacrifice my sons and my daughters unto devils? Was it in my time that the land was polluted with blood? Did I set up in the temple an image that had a fourfold idol and worship it?¹⁶ Did I portray abominable reptiles and beasts on the wall of the temple? Did Ezechiel the prophet see me weeping for Adonis and burning incense to the sun?¹⁷ [The people who did these things are the ones] about whom the apostle said: [they] ‘worshipped the creature more than the Creator.’ Did I set up in Egypt images of the two whores, namely, of A/Oholah and of A/Oholibah, and did I worship them?¹⁸ Did I worship *Bel* (*Baal*) in Babylon? Did I offer a sacrifice unto *Dagon*

¹⁵Cf. Novθεσία, 166. The argument is used there by an Iconoclast.

¹⁶This reference is rather extraordinary. I have not been able to find any instance of a fourfold idol in the Old Testament, and any occurrence of the word τετράμορφον in Greek-speaking Christianity is usually associated with the four beasts of Ezechiel (Ez. 1.5f) or, occasionally, with the Seraphim (cf. Epiphanius, *Homilia in laudes Mariae deiparae*, PG 43:496c). However, the story of this fourfold idol is present in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 103b) as a commentary on 2 Chron. 33.7 by the 2nd–3rd-century Rabbi Johanan ben Nappaha. According to this source, in the time of the prophet Isaiah, king Manasseh set up in the inner space of the Temple an idol with four faces, copied from the four figures on the throne of God (cf. Ez. 1). The idol, which was made by Manasseh’s grandfather Ahaz and was kept by him in the upper chamber of the Temple over the holy of holies, was so placed that from whatever direction one entered the Temple, one was confronted with a face of the idol (see L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, trans. H. Szold, 7 vols. [Philadelphia, 1946–47], IV:278 and VI:371–72 nn. 96–97). In the *Septuaginta*, Manasseh appears to have set up an idol in the Temple (2 Kings 20.7 and 2 Chron. 33.7), but no further details are given, and later translations of the Hebrew Old Testament (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus) are also silent (see the *Hexapla* of Origen, PG 16:227–30; I wish to thank Rabbi David Weiss-Halivni for his help with this and many other references concerning Talmudic matters). Nevertheless, I cannot claim that Moschos obtained this information through direct contact with rabbinical sources, because the same event is recorded by at least one earlier author. Eusebius of Emesa (d. before 359) in his *Sermo de paenitentia* (CPG 3530) referred to the τετραπρόσωπα εἰδωλα of Manasseh (see É. M. Buytaert, *L’héritage littéraire d’Eusèbe d’Émèse* [Louvain, 1949], 21* for the Greek text and 150–56 for an introduction). Finally, see Gouillard, “Aux origines,” 247 n. 34, for later Byzantine historiographers who used the same story.

¹⁷Cf. the Syriac *Disputation of Sergius*, XVII.1. If the copyist has not omitted anything here, we are dealing with a flawed quotation. This sentence summarizes Ez. 8.10–16, but, although its first part (βδελύγματα—ναοῦ) relies on a scriptural text that is not transmitted by the main manuscripts of the Septuagint and Origen had also checked it with an asterisk (※) in his *Hexapla* (see *Septuaginta Gottingensis*, XVI, 118–19, where Theodotion’s translation also gives a similar text), the rest of the quotation is abridged. In the vision of Ezechiel described in chap. 8, there is first a reference to the imagery on the wall of the Temple, second, the description of seventy men standing with censers, third, the presence of women weeping for Tammuz (Adonis), and fourth, twenty men in the inner court of the Temple worshiping the sun. Our text has merged parts three and four into one.

¹⁸The story of the two sisters appears in Ez. 23.4f. However, no icon of these two women worshiped by the Israelites is recorded. These sisters are accused of adultery and idolatry (Ez. 23.37f), and the only icons that are introduced in connection with them are those of the Chaldaeans (Ez. 23.14). If Moschos is not mistaken, then he is either making up a story of half (biblical) truths or devising a rhetorical question in order to make clear that he, at least, as a Christian has never worshiped unholy human beings. In any event, the two sisters and their icon are not mentioned in any other text, and I have not found any reference to them and their image in the Talmud either. So the possibility of a misunderstanding on the part of Moschos is much stronger here than in any other case, because already in the text of Ezechiel these two names symbolically represent the capitals of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah (Ohola = Samaria, Oholibah = Jerusalem; see the relevant entry in I. Singer, *Jewish Encyclopedia* [New York, 1925], 9:391).

in Palestine?¹⁹ [The prophet/apostle?] accuses of these things those who did them and proclaims these [things]—about which the Scripture cries with a loud voice—to the Jews; for where was the church of the Christians in the time of Solomon? It came into existence more than a thousand years after those events had taken place and [these words] had been spoken.²⁰ So how do you accuse of these things the Church of Christ, which has never *joined* itself *unto* idols, or sacrifices of children, or burnt sacrifices, or abominable mysteries, and [has never] served and worshiped the creature more than the creator. But heretics never understand the peculiar modes of expression²¹ of the Scripture.

“Was it not the Church of Christ that after so many years,²² in the reign of Emperor

¹⁹In these last two sentences, unless Moschos gives a mistaken biblical reference, he must be chastising the idolatry of the Chaldaeans and Philistines, and not that of the Jews, who, nevertheless, appear on many occasions to have worshiped Baal (Bel) (2 Kings 17.16, 20.3, etc.; see also Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 70.170). The Old Testament provides no specific information about Jews worshiping Bel in Babylon or offering sacrifices to Dagon in Palestine. The only problem is that the next sentence credits all these acts of idolatry to Jews, although the vagueness of its first part (Ταῦτα ἐκεῖνοις τοῖς ποιήσασιν ἐγκαλεῖ) leaves some room for the hypothesis of a wrong reference. The situation is further complicated because these two acts of idolatry are also ascribed to the Jews by two authors of the 4th and 5th centuries. The worship of Bel in Babylon is mentioned by Didymus the Blind in his *Commentarii in Zacchariam*: Πολλοὶ τῶν μετοικισθέντων ἐκ τῆς ἐαυτῶν χώρας καὶ πατρίδος εἰς τὴν τῶν κρατησάντων νόμῳ αἰχμαλωσίας, πάντα τῆς θεοσεβείας ἐκπεσόντες εἰδώλοις ἐλάτρευσαν, ὡς δουλεῦσαι τῇ [. . . .] καὶ τῷ Βῆλ καὶ τῷ δράκοντι προσκυνῆσαι, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις κοφῇ εἰκόνι Ναβουχοδονόσορ τοῦ τυράννου (see L. Doutreleau, ed., *Didyme l’Aveugle, Sur Zacharie*, III, SC 85 [Paris, 1962], 968.5) and also in his *Commentarii in Psalmos*: ἀπόσθη ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι, ὅτε τὸν Βῆλ προσεκύνουν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσορ (see M. Gronewald, ed., *Didymus der Blinde, Psalmenkommentar*, V, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 12 [Bonn, 1970], 178). On the other hand, the sacrifices to Dagon appear in a spurious sermon of John Chrysostom (possibly by Proclus, *CPG* 4597, *In principium indictionis*, PG 59:673.31–37: ὦ Ἰουδαῖε. . . . Ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μόσχον ἐχάλκευσας ἐν τῇ Μωαβίτιδι τῷ Θάματι προσεκύνησας, ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ τῷ Δαγὼν ἐθυσίσας, ἐν Φοινίκῃ τῇ Ἀστάρτῃ ἐλάτρευσας ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ τῷ Χαμῶς προσεκύνησας). However, it is evident from the first excerpt from Didymus the Blind cited above that the idea of Jews worshiping Bel in Babylon is an embellishment on the Old Testament story of *Bel et Draco*, which might have been generated by a hostile attitude toward the Jews. It is likely that the sacrifices to Dagon are part of the same stock of anti-Jewish clichés.

²⁰The author seems to be acquainted with the conventional Christian dating of Old Testament events. His placing of Solomon roughly one thousand years before the birth of Christ agrees with what most of the early historians have written. Cf. Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica*, ed. A. A. Mosshammer, Teubner ed. (Leipzig, 1984), 213: Σολομὼν τὸν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ναὸν ἀρξάμενος κτίζειν ἀπὸ δευτέρου ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, ὅπερ ἦν ἰδ’ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐν ζ’ ἔτεσιν ἐτελείωσεν ὁ γάμος αὐτοῦ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, κ’ δὲ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. εἰσὶν οὖν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως ἡ’ ἔτους αὐτοῦ ἔτη .δυσὴ (= 4477), κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀφρικανὸν .δυνζ’ (= 4456), κατὰ δὲ Εὐσέβιον .δρο’ (= 4170). Moreover, all the early Christian dating systems placed the birth of Christ at about 5,500 years after the Creation (see V. Grumel, *La chronologie* [Paris, 1958], 30). Consequently, Solomon lived some 1,023 to 1,330 years before Christ.

²¹For ἰδιώματα see Lampe, s.v. (especially B.3 for further references). The same expression (ἰδιώματα γραφῆς) is a cliché among the early fathers when it comes to scriptural exegesis (for St. Basil see his *Regulae Morales*, PG 31:728.39; for John Chrysostom see, among other references, PG 53:132.61, 234.47, 52; PG 59:229.5, 376.20, 53, etc.). See also Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum*, PG 81:32D: Ἀναγινώσκοντες, ὡς οἶμαι, τοῦτο τὸ σύγγραμμα (= Scripture) καὶ ὁρῶντες ἐν αὐτῷ μύρα καὶ φιλήματα καὶ μηροὺς καὶ κοιλίαν καὶ ὀμφαλὸν καὶ σιαγόνας . . . καὶ τῆς θείας Γραφῆς ἀγνοοῦντες τὰ ἰδιώματα, οὐκ ἠθέλησαν διαδύναμι καὶ τοῦ γράμματος ὑπερβῆναι τὸ κάλυμμα; idem, *In Divini Ezechielis prophetiam interpretatio*, PG 81:952C: Προσῆκει τὰ τῆς Γραφῆς ἰδιώματα εἰδέναι· οὐτε γὰρ ἐτέρως αὐτῆς τὸν σκοπὸν διαγνῶναι.

²²I.e., more than a thousand years.

Constantine, found at the Oak of Mamre²³ [lacuna] . . . the idols²⁴ of the worthless Apollo²⁵ and the tripod of Pausanias,²⁶ the king of the Lacedaemons, that was much celebrated among the Greeks, and destroyed them, and built a church, that is, a

²³The incident is recorded by Eusebius and other contemporary church historians (see *ODB*, II:1279–80; Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:124A). According to Sozomen (*HE*, 54.20–56.9), this holy place, two miles north of Hebron, where the three angels appeared to Abraham, hosted an annual feast celebrated by Christians, Jews, and pagans alike. When Constantine I was informed by Eutropia(?), his mother-in-law, of the festive customs, he decided to abolish the Jewish and pagan rites and to build a church in this place. Eusebius (*VC*, 99.19–101.14) preserves Constantine's letter in which the emperor ordered Macarius of Jerusalem, Eusebius, and other bishops of Palestine to burn the idols, destroy the altar that was in the place, and build a basilica (see F. W. Deichmann, "Frühchristliche Kirchen in antiken Heiligtümern," *JDAI* 54 [1939], 107–8, 120). Unfortunately, not much of this information is preserved by our dialogue since it seems that the text is corrupt (see the following note). On the other hand, recent excavations have revealed some remains of the church that was built on the site by Emperor Constantine. This church might have been reused in the Crusader period; see the entry by I. Magen in E. Stern, ed., *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, III (Jerusalem, 1993), 939–41, and also A. Ovadia, *Corpus of the Byzantine Churches in the Holy Land* (Bonn, 1970), 131–33, both with additional bibliography.

²⁴It is obvious that the Greek text from lines 50–51, τὰ ξόανα, to line 54, ἐβύθησεν, is seriously disturbed. There are three possibilities: either (1) Moschos was quoting some events from his faulty memory, or (2) Leo Kinnamos, the copyist who produced Paris. gr. 1115, misread or omitted certain words from his exemplar, or (3) a combination of (1) and (2). The emendations I have proposed simply aim at providing an intelligible text, but what is suggested here is probably far from the original. In any case, the relevant passage from Sozomen can be of considerable help, and I reproduce it here with some of its context: Sozomen, *HE*, 56.23–57.9:

τῶν δ' αὖ ξοάνων τὰ ὄντα τιμίας ὕλης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσον ἐδόκει χρήσιμον εἶναι, πυρὶ διεκρίνετο καὶ δημόσια ἐγίνετο χρήματα, τὰ δὲ ἐν χαλκῷ θανμασίως εἰργασμένα πάντοθεν εἰς τὴν ἐπόνυμον πόλιν τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος (sc. Constantinople) μετεκομίσθη πρὸς κόσμον· καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν δημοσίᾳ ἱδρύνται κατὰ τὰς ἀγυῖας καὶ τὸν ἵπποδρομον καὶ τὰ βασιλεία τὰ μὲν τοῦ Πυθίασι μαντικοῦ Ἀπολλωνος καὶ Μοῦσαι αἱ Ἑλικωνάδες καὶ οἱ ἐν Δελφοῖς τρίποδες καὶ ὁ [Πάν ὁ leg. πάνυ] βοώμενος, ὃν Πανσανίας ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος καὶ αἱ Ἑλληνίδες πόλεις ἀνέθεντο μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Μήδους πόλεμον. . . . κατεσκάφησαν δὲ τότε καὶ ἄρδην ἠφανίσθησαν ὁ ἐν Αἰγαῖς τῆς Κιλικίας Ἀσκληπιοῦ ναὸς καὶ ὁ ἐν Ἀφάκοις τῆς Ἀφροδίτης παρὰ τὸν Λίβανον τὸ ὄρος καὶ Ἀδωνιν τὸν ποταμόν.

As is evident from the above passage, a lacuna can be postulated in the dialogue before the words τὰ ξόανα, because what follows refers to items actually removed from Delphi in the reign of Constantine and not from Mamre. On the other hand, our text gives a correct reading where the editor of Sozomen was unable to come up with anything better than a name for a statue that never existed in Delphi (ὁ Πάν ὁ βοώμενος [cf. Sozomen, *HE*, index, p. 471: Πάν: Statue aus Delphi]), instead of ὁ πάνυ βοώμενος, which is implied by the reading of our manuscript. Incidentally, this "philologically incorrect" statue has attracted the attention of other scholars and has acquired an existence in K. Wernicke's entry on "Pan" in W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, III [Leipzig, 1897–1909], col. 1408; see also C. Mango, "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder," *DOP* 17 [1963], 57 n. 10).

²⁵For the statues of Apollo that were transported to Constantinople in the period under discussion, there is not much information apart from the passage of Sozomen (see previous note) and a few other historians. Eusebius (*VC*, 101.20–25) states that some bronze statues of Apollo had been erected on the streets of Constantinople (ὁδὲ μὲν τὸν Πύθιον, ἐτέρωθι δὲ τὸν Σμίνθιον, ἐν αὐτῷ δ' ἵπποδρομίῳ τοὺς ἐν Δελφοῖς τρίποδας), and Socrates only mentions the presence of statues (*HE*, PG 67:117A) for decorative purposes. In the 8th-century *Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικά*, there is not a single statue of Apollo from Delphi described (the case of a "charioteer of gods with the inscription 'All-powerful Apollo'" [ibid., 113] is unclear).

²⁶For the tripod that Pausanias dedicated to the Oracle of Delphi, the basic source is Herodotos (see C. Hude, ed., *Herodoti Historiae*, 3rd ed. [Oxford, 1975], IX.81), and also Pausanias (see H. Hitzig, ed., *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio* [Leipzig, 1910], III.2, 556.4–9). For its (possible) original position at Delphi, see A. Jacquemin and D. Laroche, "Une offrande monumentale à Delphes: Le trépied des Crotoniates," *BCH* 114 (1990), 299–323. This monument was transferred to Constantinople during the reign of Constantine and after the 9th century was set up in the Hippodrome, where the lower part of it is still preserved in poor condition. See R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, 1964), 191–92; W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls* (Tübingen, 1977), 65, 71 with further bibliography; and S. Guberti Bassett, "The Antiquities in the Hippodrome of Constantinople," *DOP* 45 (1991), 89–90. I thank Henry Maguire for the last reference.

temple, in honor of Christ?²⁷ Did not [the Church] trample upon the temple of Asklepios in Cilicia and demolish it;²⁸ did [it] not submerge the idol of Adonis²⁹ into the

²⁷There is not much archaeological evidence to support this rather imprecise and textually problematic statement of Moschos. It is questionable whether Constantine built a church at the sanctuary of Delphi. The excavation report from Delphi by G. Daux (*BCH* 86 [1962], 909–12) notes an early Christian apse in the southeast wall of the Great Sanctuary that may possibly imply the presence of a small church dating to the early 5th century. Other findings may point to an even earlier date (*ibid.*, 912), but this is the only evidence. On the other hand, E. Dyggve, following V. Laurent, has accepted the theory that the Delphic temple was transformed into a church at the beginning of the 5th century; see E. Dyggve, “Les traditions cultuelles de Delphes et l’église chrétienne: Quelques notes sur Δελφοὶ χριστιανικοί,” *CahArch* 3 (1948), 21–22. P. Amandry has suggested that the temple of Delphi had been destroyed by the Christians (“Chronique Delphique [1970–1981],” *BCH* 105 [1981], 686–87, 721–40, and *idem*, “La ruine du temple d’Apollon à Delphes,” *BACBelg*, 5th ser., 75 [1989], 26–47). However, J. M. Spieser has contested Dyggve’s position and suggested that Christian buildings and rites first appeared outside the old Delphic sanctuary and gradually moved into the pagan site, evidently not in the Constantinian period but much later (see J. M. Spieser, “La christianisation des sanctuaires païens en Grèce,” in U. Jantzen, ed., *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern* [Tübingen, 1976], 316–17; I wish to thank Carolyn Snively for this reference). More recently, F. R. Trombley has argued that Delphi kept its pagan character until the majority of its city councillors became Christian ca. 364–375 (F. R. Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529*, I [Leiden-New York-Cologne, 1993], 170, 194). The latest contribution to the subject comes from V. Déroche, who confirms the conclusions of Spieser, arguing that the Christian churches in Delphi never supplanted the Delphic temple and were erected on the periphery of the ancient sacred site. The Christianization of Delphi was slow and gradual. See V. Déroche, “Delphes: La christianisation d’un sanctuaire païen,” in *Actes du XIe Congrès International d’Archéologie Chrétienne, Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste (21–28 septembre 1986)*, Collection de l’École française de Rome 123 (Rome, 1989), 2721–23.

²⁸The destruction of this rather popular Aesculapium, situated at Aigai in Cilicia (modern Ayas on the west side of the Gulf of Iskenderun in southeastern Turkey; see *RE* 1:945), is recorded by all the church historians of the period; see Eusebius, *VC*, 103.21–104.10; Socrates *HE*, PG 67:124B; Sozomen, *HE*, 57.7–8. Eusebius writes that the sanctuary, where diseases were cured by incubation, was entirely destroyed by soldiers at the behest of Constantine (*VC*, 104.1–3), but he does not speak of any Christian church built in its place. However, Zonaras refers to an incident that took place in the reign of Justinian that might point to a possible spoliation of the temple by Christians in order to build a church at a different location (Ioannes Zonaras, *Annales*, PG 134:1152A). Evidently, apart from a temporary revival during the last year of Julian’s reign, the temple and cult of Asklepios at Aigai never recovered from the destruction and fell into decay. For a detailed survey of the sources concerning the history of this temple and of Aigai in general, see L. Robert, “De Cilicie à Messine et à Plymouth avec deux inscriptions grecques errantes,” *JSav* (1973), 183–93, repr. in L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta*, VII (Amsterdam, 1990), 247–57; also R. Ziegler, “Aigeai, der Asklepioskult, das Kaiserhaus der Decier und das Christentum,” *Tyche* 9 (1994), 187–212, esp. 207–8. To my knowledge, recent excavations have not been conducted in the area, and the latest reports from Ayas do not include any findings of pagan or Christian sanctuaries of that period (see M. V. Seton-Williams, “Cilician Survey,” *AnatSt* 4 [1954], 149). T. A. Sinclair, in his four-volume *Eastern Turkey: An Architectural and Archaeological Survey* (London, 1987–90), refers to this site only four times in passing (I:109; IV:266, 271, 371). For the latest report from the site, see H. Bloesch, *Erinnerungen an Aigeai* (Winterthur, 1989); what he found in a field filled with ruins belongs to the temple of Asklepios, but is far from giving an adequate image of the ancient shrine that Bloesch discusses mainly on the basis of numismatic evidence (*ibid.*, 26–39). However, Deichmann (“Frühchristliche Kirchen,” 129) includes it in his list of temples in Asia Minor that were converted into churches.

²⁹If the text is correct here, however, and Moschos indeed spoke of a statue of Adonis, then a theory proposed by F. Millar gains additional support. Millar notes, on the basis of other sources, that shrines in the area of Byblos were dedicated to eastern deities such as Astarte or Tammuz-Adonis. Consequently, the place at Aphaka could have been the tomb of Adonis (as it appears to be in the Syriac *Oration of Meliton the Philosopher*); see F. Millar, *The Roman Near East* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), 276–78. Thus the presence of a statue of Adonis is not to be excluded, and the dialogue might represent a source closer to the facts than Sozomen.

river?³⁰ Was it not the same Church of Christ that completely burned their splendid but worthless statue of Apollo in Daphne of Syria,³¹ and established a reliquary for the holy relics of Babylas³² the martyr?³³

“Therefore, Solomon accuses these [pagans and Jews] of those things, and also his father David, by saying: ‘*Their* [sc. the heathens] *idols are silver and gold, the work of men’s*

³⁰This sentence is drastically abridged, and the meaning of the original text utterly distorted. As one may understand from Sozomen’s text (above, note 24), there was no idol of Adonis submerged in the river (see, however, note 29). All three historians (Eusebius, *VC*, 102.29–103.20; Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:124B; Sozomen, *HE*, 57.8–9) speak of the destruction of the shrine of Aphrodite at Aphaka on Mount Lebanon in the vicinity of the river Adonis (for this river see *RE* 1:384–85). In fact, this was a rather obscure cultic site in a nonurban locale, where people practiced homosexual acts and ritual prostitution (see Millar, *The Roman Near East*, 217, 276–77). The temple was indeed razed to its foundations, and a new building was erected in its place with the same materials (see Deichmann, “Frühchristliche Kirchen,” 108, 115; Trombley, *Hellenic Religion*, I, 116). Finally, note that most of these Constantinian temple conversions are placed by the historians of that time and also—more explicitly—by Theophanes in the period following the First Ecumenical Council, that is, in the year 326 (see *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, CSHB [Bonn, 1839], 34.16–17).

³¹Daphne was a suburb of Antioch south of the city at the place where the river Orontes flows into the sea. For this event that took place in the reign of Julian (Oct. 363), see Sozomen, *HE*, 223.25–227.17, esp. 227.7–17; Theodoret, *HE*, 188.6–17; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, 22.13.1–3. The burning of this wooden statue (along with the sanctuary) is said to have been the work of a thunderbolt that fell on Apollo’s temple, while Ammianus Marcellinus states that it was the result of sparks emitted by some votive wax tapers lit by the philosopher Asclepiades before the statue. Emperor Julian, however, ordered a detailed investigation because there were many reasonable suspicions that Christians started the fire. For more details see J. den Boeft, J. W. Drijvers, D. den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXII* (Groningen, 1995), 228–32. According to Sozomen (*HE*, 227.13–16), the priest of Apollo was interrogated under torture but refused to bring any accusation against Christians. In this respect, the information provided by our text is very interesting, because, unless Moschos is overstating the events, the destruction of the statue is proudly admitted to be the work of the Christian Church. That the temple, or at least part of its precincts, was by that time used by Christians is evident from the fact that Julian ordered the removal of the remains of Christians (alone?) buried near it and the performance of purification rites similar to those with which the Athenians had purified the island of Delos (*Res Gestae*, 22.12.8; see also the following note).

³²For Babylas the martyr, who died under Decius (250–251) or Numerianus (283–284), see *ODB* I:243, with additional bibliography.

Here Moschos is again inaccurate: Sozomen (*HE*, 225.7–14, who gives a more detailed account than that of Theodoret, *HE*, 186.23–24) states that, when Julian’s brother Gallus (Flavius Claudius Constantius G.) was appointed Caesar by Constantius (352–354 A.D.) and took up residence in Antioch, he decided to purge Daphne from any licentious pagan practices and to that effect transferred the relics of Babylas there and (possibly) built a shrine at the burial place close to the temple of Daphnaïos Apollo. When Julian, on his way to Persia, wished to consult the old oracle of Apollo, he received the answer that the oracle was silent because of the presence of corpses buried near the site. Then Julian singled out the body of Babylas and demanded the transportation of his remains to Antioch. Accordingly, the Christians of Antioch formed a great procession and transferred the coffin to the city, chanting antipagan hymns. A little later the temple and the statue were burned (see den Boeft et al., *Commentary*, 225–27). So it seems that events evolved in a way different from that described by Moschos: Babylas’ remains were given their own tomb in Antioch after their transfer from Daphne. This does not necessarily preclude the eventual Christianization of the pagan shrine. (For the Daphne temple, see also Deichmann, “Frühchristliche Kirchen,” 108, 116; for the Christianization of the region around Antioch, see Trombley, *Hellenic Religion*, I, 275f.) At any rate, even if Moschos is not accurate regarding the historical circumstances and dates of the conversion of these pagan shrines into Christian churches, our text must be accepted as a valid witness to their eventual Christianization and can serve as *terminus ante quem* for this event.

³³For a similar argument (“since Christians destroy pagan temples and idols, they cannot be idolaters”), cf. Ἀντιβολή, 74.2–7; Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*, PG 89:1233A; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 68.74–75. For an interpretation of the implications of this argument, which practically advocates Christian Iconoclasm against pagan images, see D. Freedberg, *The Power of Images* (Chicago-London, 1989), 389ff.

hands. They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; they have ears, but they hear not; noses have they, but they smell not; they have hands, but they handle not; feet have they, but they walk not; neither speak through their throat. They that make them are like unto them; so is everyone that trusteth in them.’³⁴ But to the Church of Christ, Solomon cried aloud: ‘For blessed was the wood through which cometh righteousness.’ It is evident that he speaks about the Holy Cross.³⁵ And again David says to the same Church of Christ: ‘Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool; for he is holy.’³⁶

“So give me an answer: Is not the cross [made] of wood, is it not a handmade artifact? But look at the glory it has received from Christ, who was stretched on it; for [the cross] puts demons to flight, cures diseases, gives life.³⁷ For this wood Solomon proclaims, as I said before, ‘blessed was the wood through which cometh righteousness,’ and David: ‘let us worship at the place where his feet stood.’³⁸ Whom should I obey, you or David and Solomon? They say: ‘Let us worship’; you say: ‘Thou shalt not worship.’ Say, then, how do you worship your holy communion³⁹ and your book that contains the Gospels, which are all handmade artifacts, how do you worship them?⁴⁰ Whatever you are going to say, it must

³⁴The same citation is presented by a Jew in the Syriac *Disputation of Sergius*, X.2.

³⁵The same citation and interpretation appears in the *Doctrina Iacobi*, I.34.11: G. Dagron and V. Déroche, “Juifs et Chrétiens dans l’Orient du VIIe siècle,” *TM* 11 (1991), 121; cf. also Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 69.138, and the 6th-century *Anonymus dialogus cum Iudaeis*, ed. J. H. Declerck, CCSG 30 (Turnhout, 1994), IX.191.

³⁶This Old Testament passage does not easily fit the context, unless the cross is understood to be, in a literal sense, one of the places where God’s (here Christ’s) feet stood; still, the same understanding of this quotation is displayed in a spurious work attributed to St. John Chrysostom (*In adorationem venerandae crucis*, PG 62:749.80–750.5). However, in its accepted interpretation, the quotation refers to the veneration of created things through and in which God acted for humanity’s salvation. For a proper use of this excerpt, see John of Damascus, *Schriften III*, I.14.8–9 and III.34.28–29.

³⁷Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homilia in Psalmum LXXV*, PG 55:598.62–63: Εὐχὴ νεκροὺς ἀνεγείρει, δαίμονας φυγαδεύει, νόσους ἰᾶται, θανάτους ἐκλύει. According to Montfaucon (*Monitum*, PG 55:593–94), the work is spurious and seems to be a word-for-word commentary on Psalm 75 by Eusebius.

³⁸See above, note 36.

³⁹Obviously, Moschos here speaks about the Eucharist as a sequence of acts of worship; see R. F. Taft, *The Great Entrance*, OCA 200 (Rome, 1975), 45; for instances of worship (προσκύνησις) of the elements during the liturgy, see *ibid.*, 430, the Greek *textus receptus* of the Great Entrance. The Great Entrance is not clearly established as part of the liturgy until after the 5th century. However, there is already at least one 4th-century attestation of venerating the elements of the Eucharist in the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 387). See A. Piédagnel and P. Paris, *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, SC 126 (Paris, 1966), 172: Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ κοινωνῆσαί σε τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ αἵματος μὴ ἀνατείνων τὰς χεῖρας, ἀλλὰ κύπτων καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος λέγων τὸ “Ἀμήν”, ἀγιάζου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνων Χριστοῦ. I wish to thank Robert Taft, S.J., for this reference.

⁴⁰This sentence offers one more clear indication that Moschos’ interlocutor is another Christian who happens to be a heretic (cf. also the term used in line 49 by Moschos: αἰρετικοί). This is also a point where our text, as one would expect, deviates from the anti-Jewish dialogues. Basically, the argument produced by the orthodox speaker is the same here and in the anti-Jewish dialogues (“although you accuse me of worshipping objects made by human hands, you do the same”), but the enumeration of these manmade objects differs. The list of manmade objects worshiped by Jews usually features the Ark of the Covenant, the Seraphim, the Cherubim, the Book of the Laws, etc. (see Τρόπαια, 246; Ἀντιβολή, 32, etc.). Here the veneration of the Eucharist and the book of Gospels points in the direction of a non-Iconophile Christian. See also S. Der Nersessian, “Une apologie des images du septième siècle,” *Byzantion* 17 (1944–45), 65. The term μεγαλεῖον, meaning Gospel book, is very rarely attested before the 6th century. I have been able to trace this word in only one work of the 4th century in which it is used to denote the Bible. See Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 8.10.9, ed. K. Mras, *Eusebius Werke, achter Band, Die praeparatio evangelica*, GCS 43.1 (Berlin, 1954), 452.21–23: διόπερ καλῶς ὁ νομοθέτης (= Moses) ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλεῖον μετενήνοχε, λέγων τὰς συντελείας χεῖρας εἶναι θεοῦ.

apply equally to both of us. For if you worship them as handmade objects, you fall into the words of Solomon and David, ‘accursed is he, who worships [idols] made with hands,’ and you have committed [exactly] what you appear to censure others for.”⁴¹

And he said in response: “I have never worshiped objects made by human hands, but those things that I perceive to have divine power.”

The orthodox man said: “If you worship [them] on account of their possessing divine power⁴² and because you think of them and honor them as holy, then what are you accusing me of, and [why do you] rebuke me for worshiping in the same manner? *We, the true worshippers*, the people who *worship in spirit and in truth, know what we worship*, hastening to venerate the holy communion, for it is shown forth as the body of Christ and grants life to those who believe;⁴³ we worship the undefiled books of the Gospels, for [they contain] the immaculate words of God; we also worship the icon of the holy martyrs not as mere wood or as a handmade object, but as a [circumscription of] the nature of the individual contained therein,⁴⁴ who has been honored and glorified by God; for, since

στάσις δὲ θεία καλῶς ἂν λέγοιτο κατὰ τὸ μεγαλεῖον ἢ τοῦ κόσμου κατασκευή. One might explain the rarity of this word’s occurrence by taking into account its rather vernacular character.

⁴¹The same argument appears, among other works, in Severian of Gabala, *In dedicationem crucis* (cited by John of Damascus, *Schriften III*, I.58, II.54, III.52.10–13): Εἰπέ, ὦ πιστότατε Θεοῦ θεράπων· [sc. Moses] ὁ ἀπαγορεύεις, ποιεῖς; ὁ ἀνατρέπεις, κατασκευάζεις; Ὁ λέγων Ὁὐ ποιήσεις γλυπτόν, ὁ τὸν χωνευθέντα βοῦν κατελάσας, σὺ ὄφιν χαλκουργεῖς; the anonymous Διάλεξις Ἰουδαίου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, Mansi XIII, 168BC: Ὁρᾷς πῶς ὁ παραγγέλλων Μωσῆς ὁμοίωμα μὴ ποιῆσαι ὁμοίωμα ἐποίησεν; Τρόπαια, 247.8–9: Ἰδοὺ τοῖνυν καὶ ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε χειροποίητα· ἰδοὺ καὶ ὑμᾶς μέμφεται Ἡσαΐας μεθ’ ἡμῶν; and Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 66.2–67.13.

⁴²To the best of my knowledge, no other text uses the same formulation to justify the veneration of objects made by human hands. The wording here is much closer to the pagan beliefs concerning the divine powers or the divinity that especially dwells within statues (see Photios, *Bibliotheca*, III, cod. 215, p. 130, where Photios comments on a work by John Philoponos directed against the *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* of Iamblichus; neither this book nor Philoponos’ refutation is preserved, but some of the comments of Photios allow for an understanding of Iamblichus’ ideas: Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰωάννου τοῦ Φιλοπόνου Κατὰ τῆς σπουδῆς Ἰαμβλίχου, ἣν ἐπέγραψε *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων*. Ἔστι μὲν οὖν σκοπὸς Ἰαμβλίχου θεῖα τε δεῖξαι τὰ εἶδωλα . . . καὶ θείας μετουσίας ἀνάπλεα). In any case, the divine power is implicitly present in the Iconophile argument when the orthodox speaker invokes the miraculous power of the images and of the Cross. See, for example, Ps.-Athanasius, *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* (PG 28:621C: Οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀλαζονείας ἀποστρεφόμενοι προσκυνεῖν τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας, λεγέτωσαν οἱ ἀνόητοι πῶς μῦθα πολλάκις ἔβλυσαν αἱ ἄγαι εἰκόνες δυνάμει Κυρίου). On the popular belief in the divine powers (or any sort of powers) dwelling in images, see H. Maguire, “Magic and the Christian Image,” in H. Maguire, ed., *Byzantine Magic* (Washington, D.C., 1995), 51–71, esp. 51 and 67.

⁴³For the Eucharist as the body of Christ and as “medicine of immortality” (as perceived by Moschos here) in the early fathers, see J. Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition, I: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* (Chicago, 1971), 167–71, 236–38, and also J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1983), 201–2. Among other early fathers, Makarios Magnes (ca. 400) had sponsored the same idea; see his *Apocriticus*, where he asserts that the Eucharist is not τύπος σώματος οὐδὲ τύπος αἵματος . . . , ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ed. C. Blondel, *Macarii Magneti quae supersunt ex inedito codice* (Paris, 1876), 106.1.1–3.

⁴⁴Cf. Ἀντιβολή, 31.23–32.2: Καὶ οὐτε τὸ ξύλον οὐτε τὴν ζωγραφίαν προσκυνούμεν· ἐπεὶ πολλάκις τὰς εἰκόνας παλαιούμενας ἀπαλείφωμεν καὶ ἀνακαινίζομεν ἢ καὶ σαθρωθεῖσας καίωμεν (note, however, that the second part of the argument about destroyed icons is missing from Moschos); Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*, PG 89:1233D, almost a word-for-word repetition of the previous passage; Διάλεξις Ἰουδαίου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, Mansi XIII, 168B: Οὐκ οὐκ τῇ ξυλίνῃ εἰκόνι ἢ τῇ γραφίδι προσκυνούμεν ἢ σέβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῶν ὅλων δεσπότην Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν δοξολογοῦμεν; Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*, 52.12–13: οὐ γὰρ τὸ ξύλον προσκυνεῖται, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ μνημονευόμενος σεβάζεται καὶ θεωρούμενος τιμάται; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 67.43–47: Καὶ ὥσπερ σὺ προσκυνῶν τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου οὐ τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ δερμάτων καὶ τοῦ μέλανος προσκυνεῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κειμένοις, οὕτως καὶ γὰρ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσκυνῶν οὐ τὴν φύσιν τῶν

he, who has been glorified [by God] and is worshiped [by men], is a servant [of God], God who glorified him is the one that is worshiped.⁴⁵ Therefore, I worship these people, about whom Solomon says:⁴⁶ *‘But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment shall touch them. In the eyes of the fools they seemed to die; and their departure was accounted to be their hurt, and their going from us to be their ruin, but they are in peace. . . . [For] having borne a little chastening, they shall receive great good; because God tested them and found them worthy of himself; as gold in the furnace he proved them, and as a whole burnt offering he accepted them and in the time of their visitation they shall shine forth. . . . They shall judge nations, and have dominion over people, and the Lord shall reign over them for evermore.’* And again: *‘They that trust in him shall understand truth, and the faithful shall abide with him in love; because grace and mercy are to his chosen.’* And again the prophet Isaiah says: *‘Blessed are all they that wait for him.’*⁴⁷ And David says about them: *‘On behalf of the saints that are in his land the Lord has magnified all his pleasure in them.’* And elsewhere: *‘I will by no means assemble their bloody meetings.’*⁴⁸ And again: *‘God is wonderful among his holy ones, the God of Israel.’* And in another passage: *‘But thy friends, O God, have been greatly honoured by me; their rule has been greatly strengthened; I will number them, and they shall be multiplied beyond the sand.’* But also, the prophet Zechariah says: *‘The Lord my God shall come and all the Saints with thee.’*⁴⁹ And, generally speaking, if I

ξύλων καὶ χρωμάτων προσκυνῶ (μὴ γένοιτο), ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄψυχον χαρακτῆρα Χριστοῦ κρατῶν δι’ αὐτοῦ Χριστὸν κρατεῖν δοκῶ καὶ προσκυνεῖν.

⁴⁵The formulation of the argument here resembles that of many other texts considered in the frame of this study. At first sight it looks like an expansion of the basic argument derived from the famous “Iconophile” passage of St. Basil’s *De Spiritu Sancto* 18.45.19–20: διότι ἡ τῆς εἰκόνοϋ τιμὴ ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτότυπον διαβαίνει. For more details, see the discussion in the final part of this study. Cf. also Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 70.181–82 (Ὁ γὰρ τιμὴν τὸν μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν τιμᾷ) and *ibid.*, 84.φ¹⁰.1.2–3.

⁴⁶From this point on, Moschos presents a lengthy anthology of Old Testament citations that covers lines 87–103 of our text. These quotations deal with the idea of holiness, but their insertion here serves no significant purpose and seems to be a digression. Certainly, Moschos wants to legitimize the veneration of the martyrs or saints depicted in icons and employs the Old Testament in order to stress their holiness, on account of which they receive his veneration. In any event, this part of the Iconophile argument is not found in any of the other texts discussed here, at least not in the fashion Moschos expands on it.

⁴⁷This Old Testament quotation is taken from a manuscript of the *Septuaginta* that deviates slightly from the main manuscripts (see *Septuaginta Gottingensis*, XIV, 229–30) or from the Greek translation of Symmachus. (I have cited the *Septuaginta* text in the first apparatus.) If it is Symmachus, it is difficult to explain why only this citation comes from a Greek version of the Old Testament other than the *Septuaginta*. One hypothesis is that Moschos (or the unknown author) was using the *Hexapla* of Origen and mistakenly copied the version of Symmachus instead of the *Septuaginta*. It is well known that the translation of Symmachus occupied the fourth column in Origen’s *Hexapla* and the *Septuaginta* the fifth, so a confusion of the two columns would have been an easy mistake. This deviation could also indicate that our author was using a florilegium. It is also possible that the choice was intentional since the version of Symmachus (“Blessed are all they that [have] submitted to/endured[?] Him”) fits the deceased saints better.

⁴⁸It is difficult to justify the presence of this particular citation here, because its interpretation is rather complicated and not always positive. Moschos must be following (or agreeing with) the exegesis of Eusebius in his *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG 23:157AB. It could also be a clumsy abridgment of a longer, more elaborate argument.

⁴⁹This citation was taken from Zechariah and not from Isaiah as Moschos (or Kinnamos?) has stated. This mistake is a very strong indication that the author of the dialogue either used or had secondhand knowledge of an early biblical florilegium (*Book of Testimonies*). See L. Williams, *Adversus Iudaeos* (Cambridge, 1935), 8–9, for numerous mistakes of this nature among the evangelists and early Christian authors. Isaiah as a general heading in these collections has taken under its umbrella many citations from the lesser prophets.

bring forth all that has been written in Holy Scripture about the saints, *time would fail me [to talk]*.

“The catholic Church of Christ venerates and honors all over the world the images of these saints depicted in icons, extolling them and proclaiming by both pictorial representation[s] and historical narrative[s] their contests, their labors, the fasting, the all-night vigils, the almsgiving, and all their steadfastness, so that even in this *might be fulfilled the word* of David: ‘*that another generation might know, even the sons which should be born; and they should arise and declare them to their children, that they might set their hope on God.*’⁵⁰ Therefore, every believer, by seeing—as it has been said—in the pictorial representation, and by listening to the historical narrative of their contests and the likeness of their figure, is instigated to bravery, emulation, desire, and compunction and beseeches God to grant him the same calling, fate, and salvation,⁵¹ for he, moreover, witnesses miraculous cures

⁵⁰Τούτων—αὐτῶν (lines 104–11). In this passage Moschos attributes to icons a value similar to that ascribed to a written text. According to him, both icons and saints’ lives help keep alive the memory of the saints. Cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *Quaestiones ad Antiochum*, PG 28:621CD: Εἴτα τί φασὶ πρὸς ταῦτα οἱ ἐπιτρέποντες μὴ προσκυνεῖν τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τῶν ἁγίων, οὐσπερ δι’ ὑπόμνησιν καὶ μόνον ἐκτυποῦμεν, καὶ οὐ δι’ ἕτερον τρόπον; Ἀντιβολή, 32.2–3: καὶ ἄλλας καινουργίας [sc. εἰκόνας] ποιοῦμεν πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν μόνον ἀγαθῆν; the same sentence, found in Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*, PG 89:1233D; Διάλεξις Ἰουδαίου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, Mansi XIII, 168A: Αἱ γὰρ εἰκόνες ὥς θεωρεῖς, πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν τῆς φιλανθρώπου σωτηρίας γράφονται τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . . Οὐ γάρ, ὡς σὺ νοεῖς, θεοποιοῦντες αὐτὰς προσκυνοῦσιν οἱ Χριστιανοί, ἀλλὰ ζήλω πυρούμενοι καὶ πίστει τὰς τῶν ἁγίων θεωροῦσιν εἰκόνας, μνήμην φέροντες τῆς τούτων θεοσεβείας; Τρόπαια, 249: δοξάζοντες τὸν Χριστόν, τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ σεβόμεθα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν αὐτοῦ μόνον; Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*, 52.15–17: Τί οὖν; οὐκ ὀφείλομεν μᾶλλον προσκυνεῖν τοὺς ἁγίους δούλους τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ μνήμην αὐτῶν ἐγείρειν εἰκόνας καὶ ἀναστηλοῦν ἵνα μὴ ληθαργηθῶσιν; also *ibid.*, 53.29–54.33: Ἡμεῖς οὖν εἰς μνήμην τῶν ἁγίων τὰς εἰκόνας ποιοῦμεν Ἀβραάμ, Μωυσέως, . . . καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων καὶ μαρτύρων ἁγίων τῶν διὰ Θεὸν ἀναίρεθέντων, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ὄρων αὐτοὺς ἐν εἰκόνι μνημονεύῃ αὐτῶν; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 67.39–41: Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Χριστὸν καὶ τὰ Χριστοῦ πάθη ἐν ἐκκλησίαις καὶ οἰκοῖς καὶ ἀγοραῖς . . . καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐκτυποῦμεν, ἵνα διηνεκῶς ὁρῶντες ταῦτα ὑπομνησκόμεθα. See also Der Nersessian, “Une apologie,” 67. That the early Christians also perceived icons as a means of preserving a saint’s memory is attested by Epiphanius in his *Tractatus contra eos qui imagines faciunt* (CPG 3749, written ca. 392); see Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 298.13–15: Ἀλλ’ ἐρεῖς μοι ὅτι· “Οἱ πατέρες εἰδὼλα ἐθνῶν ἐβδελύξαντο, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων ποιοῦμεν εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τιμὴν ἐκείνων ταῦτα προσκυνοῦμεν.” Compare also the letter of Neilos of Ancyra to Olympiodoros Eparchos (written before 430), Mansi XIII, 36C: ἱστορίων δὲ παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας διαθήκης πληρῶσαι ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν χειρὶ καλλίστου ζωγράφου τὸν ναὸν τῶν ἁγίων, ὅπως ἂν οἱ μὴ εἰδότες γράμματα μηδὲ δυνάμενοι τὰς θείας ἀναγινώσκειν γραφὰς τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῆς ζωγραφίας μνήμην τε λαμβάνωσι τῆς τῶν γνησίως τῷ ἀληθινῷ Θεῷ δεδουλευκότων ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ πρὸς ἁμιλλαν διεγείρωνται τῶν εὐκλεῶν καὶ αἰοιδίμων ἀριστευμάτων. Thümmel believes that this passage is an Iconophile redaction; see H. G. Thümmel, “Neilos von Ankyra über die Bilder,” *BZ* 71 (1978), 10–21 (text repr. in his *Frühgeschichte*, 310). However, it is difficult to understand the reconstruction of the original text proposed by Thümmel (“Neilos von Ankyra,” 21). According to him, the non-Iconophile original of this letter should have contained something to the effect that the faithful staying within the whitewashed church of the martyrs would commemorate them by reading the accounts of their deeds. I think that the passages cited above offer numerous parallels supporting the authenticity of the Iconophile (= icons for the commemoration of the saints) version of Neilos’ letter. For additional arguments in favor of the authenticity of these letters, see Al. Cameron, “The Authenticity of the Letters of St Nilus of Ancyra,” *GRBS* 17.2 (1976), 189–92.

⁵¹For the role of icons in inciting the faithful to emulate the holy deeds depicted in them and their eventual salvific operation, see also the Διάλεξις Ἰουδαίου καὶ Χριστιανοῦ, Mansi XIII, 168A: οἱ Χριστιανοί, . . . ζήλω πυρούμενοι καὶ πίστει τὰς τῶν ἁγίων θεωροῦσιν εἰκόνας . . . Καὶ προσκυνοῦντες τὸν τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκαλοῦνται Θεόν, λέγοντες· Εὐλόγητὸς εἰ ὁ Θεός . . . ὁ δὸς αὐτοῖς ὑπομονὴν καὶ ἀξιών τῆς σῆς βασιλείας, μετόχους ἡμᾶς ποίησον αὐτῶν καὶ εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν διάσωσον ἡμᾶς; Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*, 54.33–36: Πρέπει γὰρ αὐτοῖς [sc. the saints] τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις καὶ ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰ ἡμέτερα πρὸς αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην

accomplished through their relics and images.⁵² For this reason, when I proceed in faith and devotion and kiss them, I am sanctified through my own faith in God, who has honored them and for whom they have shed their blood, refusing to worship the demonic idols of the Hellenes/pagans.⁵³

“You, however, in your error and in your ignorance of the Scriptures, bring up, in accordance with your intention, the shame, dishonor, and disgrace that the Hellenes/pagans have been accused of pouring down upon the enlightened Church of Christ.⁵⁴

αὐτῶν, ἵνα πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτοὺς σπεύσωσι καὶ αὐτοὶ μιμηταὶ γενέσθαι τῶν πράξεων [other manuscript: τῆς πολιτείας] αὐτῶν. For an earlier example, see the text of Neilos of Ancyra in the preceding note.

⁵²Cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *Quaestiones ad Antiochum*, PG 28:621c; Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 68.83: ‘Ἐκ λειψάνων μαρτύρων καὶ εἰκόνων πολλάκις ἐλαύνονται δαίμονες

⁵³Διὸ πίστει—τῶν Ἑλλήνων (lines 114–19): I have not found the idea of “being sanctified through one’s own faith in God” in any other text discussed here. In this passage, Moschos understands the veneration of the saints as a proof of his faith in God. For the last part of the sentence, cf. also Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 68.75: Εἰ τὰ εἰδῶλα προσεκύνουν, διὰ τί λοιπὸν τιμῶ τοὺς μάρτυρας τοὺς καταλύσαντας τὰ εἰδῶλα;

⁵⁴It seems that Moschos here tries to say that the Hellenes/pagans have accused Christians of impiety in general, while they themselves were impious. If, however, Moschos refers to what has already been said, this implies that the Hellenes/pagans have accused Christians of idolatry, which is rather odd. From what is generally known, idolatry was a predominantly Christian accusation directed against the pagans in the early centuries and was then taken over by Jews in their polemic against Christians in the 7th century (see P. Alexander, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* [Oxford, 1958], 23–34; Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 29–42, 96–102, and 118–27). There are very few recorded occasions on which pagans have addressed the issue of venerating images, statues, or other created things such as the Cross or relics. Even in these texts, however, all that pagans claim is that there is no practical difference between the Christian and the pagan veneration of manmade or created objects. Julian, in his *Κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγος* A, brings up the issue in the following words: εἴτα, ὦ δυστυχεῖς ἄνθρωποι [sc. Christians], σφζομένον τοῦ παρ’ ἡμῖν ὅπλου διοπετοῦς . . . προσκυνεῖν ἀφέντες καὶ σέβεσθαι, τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνεῖτε ξύλον, εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ σκιαγραφοῦντες ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ καὶ πρὸ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἐγγράφοντες (see C. I. Neumann, *Iuliani Imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* [Leipzig, 1880], 196). Another telling example comes from the Latin *Consultationes Zacchei christiani et Apollonii philosophi*, written, in all probability, in Palestine in the years 408–410 (see J. L. Feiertag and W. Steinmann, eds., *Questions d’un païen à un chrétien*, 2 vols., SC 401–2 [Paris, 1994], I:22–25). In chap. 28 of the first book (ibid., 172), a certain Apollonius Philosopher poses the following question: “2. Nos enim eorum simulacra vel imagines adoramus quos vel vera religione deos credimus, vel antiquorum traditionibus docti deos non esse nescimus. 3. Vos vero, quibus istud abominatio est, cur imagines hominum, vel ceris pictas, vel metallis defictas, sub regum reverentia etiam publica adoratione veneramini, et, ut ipsi praedicatis, deo tantum honorem debitum etiam hominibus datis?” On the Greek side of Christianity, see the early-7th-century dialogue of John of Thessalonica, Mansi XIII, 164A: ‘Ο Ἑλλην εἶπεν· “Ἦμεῖς οὖν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις εἰκόνας οὐ γράφετε τοῖς ἁγίοις ὑμῶν καὶ προσκυνεῖτε αὐτούς; Καὶ οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἁγίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ ὑμῶν; Οὕτως οὖν νόμιζε καὶ ἡμᾶς τὰ βρέτη περιθάλλοντας· οὐκ αὐτὰ προσκυνεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰς δι’ αὐτῶν θεραπευομένας ἀσμάτους δυνάμεις.” Ibid., 164D–165A: ‘Ο Ἑλλην εἶπεν· “Ἔστω, τὸν Θεὸν λόγον ὡς ἐνανθρωπήσαντα εἰκονογραφεῖτε· τί περὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων φатέ; Ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὺς ζωγραφεῖτε ὡς ἄνθρώπους καὶ προσκυνεῖτε. . . . Οὕτω νόμιζε καὶ τοὺς παρ’ ἡμῶν τιμωμένους θεοὺς διὰ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων θεραπεύεσθαι, μηδὲν ἄτοπον ἡμῶν διαπραττομένων, ὥστε οὐδὲ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν γραφομένων ἀγγέλων.” See also the late-6th- or early-7th-century *Laudatio omnium martyrum* of Constantine the deacon and chartophylax, Mansi XIII, 185BC: “Τί δὲ καὶ παρ’ ὑμῖν,” οἱ τύραννοι [sc. the pagan judges] διεξήλθον, “Ὁ φатε θεῖον ἐν εἰκόσιν οὐκ ἐγχαράττετε; Πῶς οὖν ἡμῖν διαλοιδορεῖσθε, δεισιδαιμονέστερον ἐφ’ ὁμοίαις πράξεσι διακείμενοι;” “Οὐκοῦν ἐπέπερ ἡμῖν [sc. the martyrs], ὦ δικασταί, τοῖς εὐεξελέγκτοις ψόγοις τὴν τῶν εἰκόνων γραφὴν παραρτῦετε, φέρε τῆς περὶ τοῦτο πλάνης καὶ ἀμφιβολίας ὑμᾶς ἀπαλλάξωμεν.” It is also certain that by the 4th century the pagans had accused Christians of idolatry on account of the veneration given to the martyrs. Asterius of Amaseia, in his tenth homily, found himself obliged to clarify the situation in the following words: Τὸ αὐτὸ δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μάρτυσι πέπονθεν, ὧν καταφρονοῦσι πολλοὶ ὑπὸ ἰδίας ἀνοίας ἐξευτελίζοντες αὐτῶν τὸ ἀξίωμα. “Οὐκ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν; Οὐκ ἐδαπανήθη τὸ σῶμα; Οὐκ ἐν ὀλίγοις λειψάνοις καὶ τοῦτοις ἐγκεχωσμένοις αὐτῶν ἡ μνήμη;” Μάλιστα δὴ ταῦτα Ἕλληνες καὶ Εὐνομιανοὶ φασιν· εἶπωμεν πρὸς ἀμφοτέρους. “Ἦμεῖς μάρτυρας οὐ προσκυνούμεν, ἀλλὰ τιμῶμεν ὡς γνησίους προσκυνητὰς

You must understand that you will be held responsible to the fearsome tribunal⁵⁵ for all your impiety and for the blasphemy to his saints.

“But show me your church⁵⁶ having ever expelled any demons; show me the relics of Sabbatios⁵⁷—whom you revere—having prevailed over diseases or having cured any illnesses. However, not even Sabbatios himself saved you from your paternal error.”

Then the heretic replied to him by saying: “Behold, concerning Solomon, you have proved for whom he says ‘thou shalt not worship’; [that] I do accept. Concerning Sabbatios, however, you should not bring forward something that has not been proven.”

And he said: “I can assure you even about these [things] . . .”

IV. DISCUSSION

The Nature, Sources, and Dating of the Dialogue

It is difficult to determine whether this dialogue is the record of an actual discussion that took place between two Christians or the work of an author who chose to expound

Θεοῦ· οὐ σέβομεν ἀνθρώπους . . . Ἐξετάσωμεν λοιπὸν καὶ τὰ σά, εἰ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος ὁ κατήγορος καθαρεύεις. Καὶ πῶς, ὅς γε μυρίους τῶν τεθνεώτων ἀνθρώπων οὐ τιμᾷς, ἀλλ’ ὡς Θεοὺς προσκυνεῖς; Οὐ σὺ Δήμητραν καὶ Κόρην ὑπὸ τῆς ἀνοίας σου τοῦ ἐθέωσας” (C. Datema, ed., *Asterius of Amasea, Homilies I–XIV* [Leiden, 1970], 139.18–24, 140.1–3). The homily was first delivered before 395 (ibid., xxiii).

⁵⁵ Cf. John Chrysostom, *In decem virgines*, PG 59:531.19–20: Φοβερῷ κριτηρίῳ.

⁵⁶ This is one more indication of the identity of Moschos’ interlocutor. It is clear that he is a member of a Christian church different from the orthodox Church to which Moschos belongs. The idea that the Novatians (and probably the Sabbatians) formed a separate church (ἐκκλησία) was not alien to the early authors. Sozomen, for example, speaks about their church in rather favorable terms and refers to the Novatians as ἡ Ναυατιανῶν ἐκκλησία (*HE*, 327.13, 18 and 348.9–11: Ναυατιανοὶ δέ, εἰ καὶ τινες τούτων ἐτάραττεν ἢ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα ζήτησις ἦν Σαββάτιος ἐνεωτέρισεν, ἀλλ’ οὖν οἱ πλείους ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας ἡρέμουν. However, the distinction between the Novatian and the orthodox Church is much more clear in a passage where Sozomen speaks about Sisinnios, the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, who was much liked even by the bishops of the καθόλου ἐκκλησία [ibid., 348.22–24]). Socrates also refers to them in the same terms (cf. *HE*, PG 67:624AB, and also 745C, where Sabbatios appears to have set up his own church: Σαββάτιος μὲν οὖν . . . τῆς Ναυατιανῶν Ἐκκλησίας ἀνεχώρησε, πρόφασιν τὴν παρατήρησιν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ Πάσχα ποιούμενος. Παρασυνάγων οὖν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἑαυτοῦ Σισιννίῳ ἐν τόπῳ τῆς Πόλεως).

⁵⁷ The name of Sabbatios is the final and invaluable piece of information that allows for a secure identification of Moschos’ opponent. Undoubtedly, here we have a fragment from a dialogue between an orthodox Christian and a Sabbatian. I discuss this issue further in the last part of this study. On Sabbatios, apart from the literature mentioned above in note 8, see also the entry “Sabbatiens” by É. Amann in *DTC* 14.1 (1939), cols. 430–31. Sabbatios, who was born a Jew, probably in the second half of the 4th century, converted to Christianity and joined the ranks of the Novatian church. He was ordained a priest in 384 but a little later withdrew from that church. Socrates states that the main reason for this was Sabbatios’ strong desire for a bishopric, though Sabbatios himself affirmed that his dissent focused on the observance of Easter. As a Novatian priest, Sabbatios, following a canon introduced by an earlier synod of Novatian bishops at a Phrygian village called Pazos, celebrated Easter at the same time as the Jewish Passover (Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:621C/745C). Eventually, in 407, a year of uncertainty in the Novatian church, Sabbatios managed to be elected bishop by a few prelates. However, the Novatians finally succeeded in consecrating a certain Chrysanthos as bishop, and this is how the final separation between the Novatians and the Sabbatians occurred (Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:760A). It is impossible to establish the extent of Sabbatios’ influence after his separation from the Novatian church, but imperial legislation turned against the Sabbatians as early as 413, while still favoring the Novatians (*CTh* 16.6.6). A little later, however, the Byzantine state began to oppress both the Sabbatians and the Novatians, and in *CTh* 16.5.59 (of the year 423) and 16.5.65 (of the year 428) they share the fate of other heretics, such as the Macedonians, the Eunomians, or even the Manichees. As for the rest of Sabbatios’ life, we know that he was exiled to Rhodes (probably after 413; see Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:796A) and that he died there. His remains were indeed the subject of veneration by his followers, who eventually transferred

his ideas in this particular form. The first hypothesis can be supported by what the text itself provides, assuming that Leo Kinnamos did not significantly alter the text of his exemplar.⁵⁸ One could support the oral character of the dialogue on the basis of a number of standard expressions that constitute part and parcel of an oral discourse and contribute to its vividness (e.g., line 35: Λέγε οὖν μοι; line 72: εἰπὲ οὖν; line 66: Ἀποκρίθητι οὖν μοι). There are also some instances of irregular syntax, for example, in lines 82–84 and 86–87, where the verb προσκυνεῖν takes an object in both the accusative and the dative (προσκυνοῦμεν τὰ ἄχραντα μεγαλεῖα . . . · προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ τῇ εἰκόνι τῶν ἁγίων. . . . Ἐκείνους οὖν προσκυνῶ . . .),⁵⁹ or the following anacolouthon: προστρέχοντες τῇ ἁγίᾳ κοινωνίᾳ ὡς σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναδειχθεῖσα καὶ ζῶν ἡραριζομένη. In addition, one should note the inaccuracy of many of the biblical quotations in the text.⁶⁰ This inaccuracy could be the result of quoting from memory, and this gives some additional support for the oral nature of the dialogue. It could also be an indication that the author was using some of the anti-Jewish florilegia, already in place even before the appearance of the Gospels.⁶¹

Also noteworthy is the quotation in lines 68–69 based on John Chrysostom(?) and the similarity between the text in lines 50–54 and fragments from Sozomen (see note 24). Here again it is difficult to decide whether the author of the dialogue had at his disposal the text of Sozomen (written between 443 and 450; see Sozomen, *HE*, lxv) or one of Sozomen's sources, or whether Moschos was quoting from memory texts that were in general circulation. If the latter is true, it would help explain the various inaccuracies pointed out above (notes 24, 27, and 30–32).

The possible connection of this work with a significant number of existing written sources, and even with the Talmud, implies that Moschos (or the anonymous author) had access to a library furnished with many early patristic works and the entire Scriptures or at least a biblical florilegium.⁶² Moreover, an external characteristic of the dialogue—the distribution of the spoken words between the two discussants—renders any pretense of oral discourse ineffective. A quick calculation shows that the heretic is heard only three

them to Constantinople in the patriarchate of Attikos (406–425). Socrates again provides the last piece of information regarding the fate of these relics in Constantinople: Attikos, in order to avoid any further development of a Sabbatian cult, had the remains exhumed and buried in an unknown place (Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:796A). After that the Sabbatians appear in various sources, but the use of the term is rather problematic; see Gouillard, “L'hérésie,” 304, 306, 310–11; see also below, notes 71 and 112–14.

⁵⁸ For Kinnamos as a copyist, see Munitiz, “Le Parisinus Graecus 1115,” 54–57, and Alexakis, *Codex Parisinus*, passim. As I have shown, Kinnamos tends to omit phrases or words from a fragment, especially when it happens to be a biblical quotation; see also my article, “Some Remarks on the Colophon of the Codex Parisinus Graecus 1115,” *Revue d'histoire des textes* 22 (1992), 137–39.

⁵⁹ It seems that this double syntax of the verb προσκυνεῖν is common in the written sources of the early Byzantine period; cf. Déroche in Leontios of Neapolis, “L'Apologie,” 70.175 (accusative) and 70.182 (dative).

⁶⁰ E.g., the first quotation (lines 6–14), where the manuscript preserves a text in which the subject is in the third person plural instead of the singular; the next citation (lines 15–17), the first part of which does not exist in the edited text of the Old Testament; one more citation, which is cited under a wrong name (lines 102f); and the wrong references to the two prostitutes and the otherwise unknown veneration of their image (lines 41–42).

⁶¹ See Williams, *Adversus Iudaeos*, 3–13, 124–31; also for the collections of Cyprian, Ps.-Gregory of Nyssa, and others, see H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (I.–II. Jh.)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1982), 235, 299, 332, 367. It must be admitted that the material found in these collections is not relevant to the subject of our dialogue.

⁶² For the possible presence of the *Hexapla* of Origen among these works, see above, note 47.

times (lines 5–17, 77–78, and 126–27), and his utterances cover less than 11 percent of the entire text. If it were not for the lengthy quotation from the Wisdom of Solomon in lines 5–14, this figure would be even lower. So we are practically dealing with a monologue rather than a dialogue: the heretical voice is there in order to provoke the lengthy orthodox responses, but we learn nothing about the beliefs of the heretic, apart from generalities. According to V. Déroche, this is an indication of the fictive character of such a work.⁶³ Therefore, it seems possible that our text is a fictitious dialogue whose original title was Διάλογος Μόσχου μοναχοῦ καὶ ἐγκλείστου πρὸς (τινα ?) Σαββατιανόν.

Concerning the sources of the text, it is obvious that the vast majority of the excerpts found in it come from the Wisdom of Solomon and from the Psalms. Noteworthy also is at least one reference to the Talmud. The “hidden quotation” in lines 68–69 from the work of Ps.-John Chrysostom is a rather short and catchy one for someone to remember easily, but that does not preclude the availability of that particular work in the library of Moschos (or of the anonymous author).

Puzzling, however, is the relationship of lines 50–54 to the ecclesiastical history of Sozomen. At first sight, Moschos’ words look like a summary account of what Sozomen has written, yet they preserve a correct reading that none of the manuscripts of Sozomen has transmitted.⁶⁴ One potential solution is to postulate a common source behind Moschos and Sozomen, but the problem with the striking similarity between the two texts on the tripod of Pausanias makes this option impossible. A second, rather better, explanation might be the hypothesis that Moschos or the anonymous author had access to a manuscript of Sozomen that was better than those that have preserved his work to date. What is preserved in the *Historia tripartita* (attributed to Cassiodorus but written by his disciple Epiphanius) seems to corroborate the fact that a little more than a hundred years after the death of Sozomen the manuscript tradition of his work was already faulty. To be sure, the *Historia tripartita* gives a mostly accurate translation of almost the entire chapter to which the passage cited above (note 24) belongs. It skips, however, the disputed line (καὶ ὁ [Πᾶν ὁ leg. πάνν] . . . μετὰ τὸν πρὸς Μήδους πόλεμον).⁶⁵ In any case, all

⁶³For the dialogue as a genre and its relation to reality, see Déroche, “La polémique,” 281–97, though Déroche deals almost exclusively with Judaeo-Christian dialogues. He is of the opinion that, for the period after the 6th century, these dialogues were the result of two rather contradictory realities: “l’existence de débats bien réels et la tendance à un usage interne” (ibid., 288). An author of such a dialogue was interested in presenting the Jewish argument in order to show its weakness, not in letting the Jew defend his position. Thus, “nous pouvons donc admettre que ces textes nous donnent en quelque sorte les têtes de chapitres de la polémique des Juifs contre les Chrétiens et le plein développement de la réponse chrétienne; cette hypothèse explique la disproportion entre l’extension des démonstrations du Chrétien et la maigreur de ceux du Juif. . . . En somme, cette littérature polémique présente des débats fictifs qu’elle imagine en bonne partie à l’aide des textes antérieurs, mais elle reflète bien une réalité contemporaine et peut, au moins dans l’esprit de ses auteurs, contribuer indirectement à une conversion des Juifs” (ibid., 289). It is striking that the *Dialogue of Moschos* also conforms to this theory, even though it is a little earlier than the 6th century.

⁶⁴See above, note 24.

⁶⁵For the sources of Sozomen, see G. Schoo, *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Sozomenos* (Aalen, 1973), 138. It is characteristic that Schoo also accepts the correctness of the reading ὁ Πᾶν ὁ βοώμενος and classifies this remark as “selbständig.” For the rest of the passage, Schoo gives Eusebius’ *VC* as a source. It is clear, however, that our text is much closer to Sozomen than to Eusebius. For the *Historia tripartita*, see W. Jacob and R. Hanslik, eds., *Cassiodori-Epiphani Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1952), xiii–xvi; the passage in question is on pp. 118–19.

other ecclesiastical histories, with the exception of Eusebius' (*VC* 101.25–26), are silent about Delphi. Finally, one has to exclude as possible sources any late anti-Jewish dialogues for the simple reason that the argument here develops exclusively between Christians and no one mentions the Jews in conjunction with the issue of image worship.⁶⁶

The dating of this work presents some difficulties, and for the latest *terminus post quem* much depends on the sources of the dialogue. At any rate, the datable events in the text do not go beyond the year 425 (death of Patriarch Attikos)⁶⁷ or 450, if we agree that Moschos was using the ecclesiastical history of Sozomen. Many of these events are much earlier (e.g., the destruction of the pagan temples [326] and the burning of the statue of Daphnaios Apollo [363]). I am inclined to place the composition of the dialogue in the period 425–460 for the following reason: at the end of the dialogue, Moschos refers to the relic of Sabbatios, who is the object of veneration on the part of his interlocutor. The vague allusion of the latter to events that cannot be proven implies that the incident of the “disappearance” of Sabbatios' relic (see note 57) was still fresh. Besides, the period after 423, in which two imperial edicts were issued against the Sabbatians (and other heretics), offers an appropriate historical context for the creation of such a text.⁶⁸

On the other hand, one could claim that the dialogue might have been a later product (first half of the seventh century) because of its similarities with many anti-Jewish dialogues of that period. This suggestion, however, fails to explain the conspicuous absence in the dialogue of any reference to the term “Judaizing” in connection with the veneration of manmade objects. If this absence means something, it concerns the dating of the text: a dialogue between an orthodox Christian and a non-Iconophile Christian, in which the former does not accuse the latter of Judaizing, must have come from a period before the entrance of the Jews into the dogmatic disputations related to the worship of manmade objects, that is, before the seventh or even the late sixth century.⁶⁹

Finally, the possible association of the text with pagan anti-Christian literature (see note 54) does not have any implication for the dating of the dialogue, since, even if a number of the points made in it recur more frequently in the seventh century, they had already emerged during the fourth or the third century. And pagan, as well as Christian (e.g., Epiphanius of Salamis), charges of Christian “idolatry” were floating around earlier than the fifth century. Moreover, this charge might have come up in the course of the trials of the Christian martyrs in the third-century persecutions.⁷⁰ So, given the historical circumstances and the general pattern of the development of the Sabbatian heresy, along with a number of formulations and expressions shared between the dialogue and other

⁶⁶See below, note 69.

⁶⁷See above, note 57.

⁶⁸Another relevant historical example is provided by the composition of the *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*: it followed the forced baptism of the Jews of Carthage imposed by Herakleios; see Dagron and Déroche, “Juifs et Chrétiens dans l'Orient,” 230–31.

⁶⁹See Déroche, “La polémique,” 290–91, and E. Kitzinger, “The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm,” *DOP* 8 (1954), 130 n. 204, with bibliography.

⁷⁰Cf. the *Laudatio omnium martyrum* (above, note 54), a late text but referring to the period of the Roman persecutions; see also the text of Asterios of Amaseia, *ibid.*

works of the late fourth to early fifth century, the second third of the fifth century is the most likely period for the composition of the dialogue.⁷¹

The Iconophile Arguments of the Dialogue and Its Testimony concerning the Veneration of Relics and Icons

The parts of the dialogue that deal with issues other than the veneration of manmade objects are so brief (lines 2–5 and 127–28) that they do not allow for much further comment. That the rejection of penitence and the cult of Sabbatios were part of the Sabbatian belief has already been noted.⁷² The dialogue reveals a much more significant aspect of the Sabbatian heresy, its apparent iconophobia, which is the starting point for the development of the Iconophile arguments of Moschos that occupy almost the entire dialogue.

The first point that strikes one is that the subject introduced by the Sabbatian and discussed by Moschos is not only the veneration of images but the worship of manmade objects in general. This is an additional sign of the early date of the dialogue, and it also shows the Old Testament origins of the problem of the veneration of created matter.⁷³

The Sabbatian introduces the problem of venerating images “and other things” with two quotations from the Wisdom of Solomon (lines 5–17), the second of which is directly against the veneration of any manmade or created object. The orthodox Moschos responds with the argument that his opponent does not understand the Scripture, arguing that these accusations were aimed at the Jews and the pagans who had worshiped created things and idols. He supports his counterargument with a number of Old Testament

⁷¹It is true that the Sabbatians surfaced in later sources such as the 9th- or 10th-century *Vita Ignatii* (PG 105:493c) and are sometimes confused with the Quartodecimans, but in general, like the Novatians and the Quartodecimans, they almost disappear from the scene in the latter part of the 5th century, receiving only a few sporadic mentions by later authors. For instance, already before the 7th century, Leontios, presbyter of Constantinople, refers to them only in his ninth sermon in connection with the celebration of Easter (see C. Datema and P. Allen, eds., *Leontii Presbyteri CPolitani, Homiliae*, CCSG 17 [Turnhout, 1987], IX.29). The early-7th-century Timotheos, presbyter of Constantinople, refers to them in passing only to connect them with the Novatians and castigates them over the celebration of Easter (*De iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt*, PG 86.1:36A–37B). Anastasius Sinaites completely ignores them in his *Hodegos* (K. H. Uthemann, ed., *Anastasii Sinaitae, Viae Dux*, CCSG 8 [Turnhout, 1981]). Patriarch Germanus, in his *De haeresibus et synodis*, briefly refers to them once, in order to stress their similarity to the Novatians and the Montanists (PG 98:87AB). Epiphanius, who died in 403, may rightly ignore them in his *Panarion*, but they are also absent from John of Damascus’ *Liber de haeresibus* (*Schriften IV*, 19–57). At any rate, they are mentioned by the 10th-century *Synodicon Vetus* in such a way as to imply their existence up to that time; see J. Duffy and J. Parker, *The Synodicon Vetus*, CFHB 15 (Washington, D.C., 1979), 62: Σαββάτιος πολλοὺς τῶν Βυζαντίων συνήρπασε, παρ’ οὗ καὶ Σαββατιανοὶ μέχρι καὶ σήμερον λέγονται. I have found no mention of them in the *Synodicon of Orthodoxy*; see J. Gouillard, “Le Synodikon de l’Orthodoxie, édition et commentaire,” *TM* 2 (1967), 1–316. Finally, there is not a single reference to them in the *Bibliotheca* of Photios (J. Schamp, ed., *Photius, Bibliothèque*, IX, Index [Paris, 1991]).

⁷²For the issue of penitence, cf. also Germanus, *De haeresibus et synodis*, PG 98:85AB: Γειτονοῦσι δὲ πῶς καὶ ἀγχίθυροι, ὥς εἰπεῖν, εἰσὶ τινες τῶν αἰρετικῶν . . . Ἀνόμοιοι τῷ Ἀρεῖῳ, Ναυάται τοῖς Σαββατιανοῖς, ἀμφότεροι δὲ εἰς τὸν περὶ μετανοίας λόγον τοῖς Μοντανοῖς. We do not know much about the Sabbatian position on penitence, but for the Novatians, who shared their beliefs, see Vogt, *Coetus Sanctorum*, 57–83.

⁷³A similar situation is observed in the 7th-century anti-Jewish dialogues; see Déroche, “La polémique,” 291: “Le fond de la critique porte en effet non pas sur l’existence d’images, mais sur l’adoration du *créé*, qui menace celle due au Créateur seul; rendre la proskynèse à un objet revient à en faire une idole; de ce point de vue, même la proskynèse d’une personne pourrait constituer un blasphème. C’est cette opposition créé/non-créé qui fonde le débat.” As will become clear, this is also the core of the argument expanded in the dialogue.

examples (lines 30–44). The orthodox thesis is that Solomon's prohibitions refer to a different time and a totally different situation. The logic is simple: what a Christian venerates is much different from the idols of the pagan past during which the Christian Church did not exist (lines 45–48). Moschos then advances the argument one step further, asserting that not only has the Christian Church never committed any acts of idolatry, but that from its very first (official) steps it turned against paganism and destroyed idols and pagan temples (lines 50–57). And if Solomon and David had castigated the idolatry of the heathens, they did not include veneration of the Cross in their condemnation. On the contrary, when they spoke (allegorically) about the Cross, they suggested its veneration even though it is a manmade object (lines 57–64). Besides, the Cross has been accorded exceptional glory because Christ was stretched on it, and its power extends over demons and illnesses (lines 65–69).⁷⁴ The orthodox argument culminates here: if Solomon and David—whose authority is acknowledged by both discussants—had legitimized the veneration of the Cross, then why does Moschos' interlocutor want to ban it (lines 70–72)? Then Moschos turns to some manmade objects that are worshiped by his opponent, that is, the elements of the Holy Eucharist and the book of Gospels. Furthermore, Moschos asks for a fair consideration of his case by his opponent who practices the same thing he does (lines 72–77). The Sabbatian, in a rather awkward position, maintains that he does not worship manmade objects but some things that he views as having divine power (lines 77–78). This is not the best argument because the formulation could again evoke idolatry;⁷⁵ however, Moschos agrees to it and expounds on why Christians worship the Holy Eucharist, the Gospels, and the icons of the martyrs. He also makes clear that what is worshiped is not the nature of the wood nor the manmade object, but the "servant of God" represented in the image and, through him, God himself (lines 78–86). Next comes a lengthy florilegium comprising Old Testament quotations that describe the nature of the holy person (lines 87–103). Though it does not serve any clear purpose at first sight, this digression helps Moschos add two other serious arguments in defense of image worship. The first has to do with the educational/commemorative purpose that any pictorial representation can serve, supplementing that of a written text; the second revolves around the idea of images (and texts) as representations of role models for Christians (lines 104–15).⁷⁶ Finally, Moschos closes his argument with a brief reference to the healing power of the images and relics of the saints and presents his image worship as a proof of his faith in God (lines 115–19). The Sabbatian acknowledges defeat on the subject and proceeds with a somewhat related topic, the veneration or cult of the relic of Sabbatios.

The arguments used by Moschos in defense of the veneration of manmade objects are rather undeveloped and not as sophisticated as those found, for example, in the anti-Jewish dialogue of Leontios of Neapolis, although they are more or less the same. Dé-

⁷⁴One more argument addressed from a Christian to another Christian.

⁷⁵See above, note 42. From this point of view, the basic distinction between idolatry and Christian veneration can be found in the words of Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*, 51.3–5: Περί δὲ τῶν εἰκόνων τῶν ἁγίων θαρροῦμεν ὅτι πᾶν ἔργον γινόμενον ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Θεοῦ καλὸν ἐστὶν καὶ ἅγιον. Ἐτερον δὲ ἐστὶν εἰκὼν καὶ ἕτερον εἶδωλον. Everything related to the Christian God is good; the rest is evil.

⁷⁶For the connection and complementary function of Christian text and image, see in general H. Maguire, *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium* (Princeton, N.J., 1994), esp. 34–42.

roche has given a detailed analysis of these arguments, so I do not repeat them here.⁷⁷ However, given the early date of the *Dialogue of Moschos* and its nature, it is important to establish the place this text occupies in the development of Iconophile doctrine. I have already stressed that the dialogue does not deal exclusively with the veneration of icons but encompasses the veneration of created things in general. Although the Sabbatian starts out by accusing his orthodox opponent of worshipping “icons and other things” (lines 6 and 14–17), the scriptural passages he adduces in support of this accusation speak generally about manmade objects (lines 6–14 and 16). The orthodox speaker later specifies the manmade objects that receive his veneration in the following order: the Holy Cross (implied in lines 64–71), the Holy Eucharist (lines 81–82), the Gospel book (lines 82–83), and the icons of the holy martyrs (lines 83–85). To these I would add the relics of the saints.⁷⁸ It is remarkable that the image of Christ is absent from this list, although much is said about the icons of the holy martyrs and their content (lines 83–87 and 104–16). I assume that this is because the creation and subsequent veneration of any image of Christ were still debatable in the fifth century. Although one cannot read into the dialogue either a total rejection of this particular veneration or a full-fledged worship of Christ’s icons, a number of literary sources pertaining to this period display ambiguity on that issue.⁷⁹ And if Christology did enter the debate already during the period under consideration, it was in order to refute the possibility of any pictorial representation of Christ.⁸⁰ Perhaps Moschos was aware of this problem and passed over it in silence. The Cross is the only thing related to Christ that receives the veneration of Moschos (as implied in lines 169–71), but the Cross was never denied any honor, even by the Iconoclasts.⁸¹

⁷⁷At many points I have given the parallel passages from other texts in the notes to the translation of the dialogue. Here I give the relevant references to the analysis of particular arguments by Déroche. For the Christian argument that it was the Jews who first committed acts of idolatry, see Déroche in Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie,” 88; for the commemorative function of the images, see *ibid.*, 92; for the Judaic parallel to the Christian veneration of the Eucharist and the Gospels, see *ibid.*, 90; for the honor paid to the saints that is eventually addressed to God, see *ibid.*, 91–92.

⁷⁸The relics of the saints are briefly referred to in line 115, along with their icons, as sources of healing miracles.

⁷⁹Most of the texts to which I refer are conveniently collected in E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder: Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, TU 18, n.s., 3 (Leipzig, 1899), 98*–109*; for a fresh approach to a number of them, see Ch. Murray, “Art and the Early Church,” *JTS* 28.2 (1977), 303–45; *eadem*, “Le problème de l’iconophilie et les premiers siècles chrétiens,” in F. Böspflug and N. Lossky, eds., *Nicée II, 787–1987: Douze siècles d’images religieuses* (Paris, 1987), 39–50. See also Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 47–102, esp. 96ff and 282–319, for another set of primary sources partly overlapping with those of von Dobschütz.

⁸⁰See Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 99–100, and S. Gero, “The True Image of Christ: Eusebius’ Letter to Constantia Reconsidered,” *JTS* 27 (1981), 460ff. Concerning Christology and its adoption by the Iconophile party, see now the excellent article of T. F. X. Noble, “John Damascene and the History of the Iconoclastic Controversy,” in *Religion, Culture and Society in the Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan* (Kalamazoo, Mich., 1987), 95–116, which provides a detailed bibliography and review of earlier literature on the subject. See also J. R. Payton Jr., “John of Damascus on Human Cognition: An Element in His Apologetic for Icons,” *Church History* 65 (1996), 173–83 and esp. 174 n. 5, for an updated bibliography. As a matter of fact, pictorial representations of Christ were slow to develop, and the earliest images of Christ alone are documented only from the 6th century; see *ODB* I:437, and Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 1–2.

⁸¹For the early period see Kitzinger, “The Cult,” 89–90; for the Iconoclast period see S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III*, CSCO, Subsidia 41 (Louvain, 1973), 113–26.

Moschos' support for the veneration of manmade objects is based on the following arguments: (1) One cannot apply the Old Testament prohibitions against worshiping manmade objects to the Christian veneration of icons "and other things" because these restrictions were addressed to Jews and pagans. (2) The Christian Church cannot be accused of idolatry because it is the one that has destroyed the idols. (3) The Old Testament allegorically prescribes the veneration of the Cross. (4) The veneration of the image of a saint constitutes honor to the saint proper and an eventual worship of God. (5a) The images, as well as hagiographic literature, preserve the memory of the saints and in this way (b) instruct and set the Christian role models for the faithful to imitate. Finally, (6) some images, along with relics, possess miraculous powers.

As I have indicated in the relevant notes, all the main arguments summarized here, along with some secondary ones (e.g., the idea that the non-Iconophile discussant also venerates manmade objects), reappear in later anti-Jewish dialogues⁸² before their final incorporation into the mainstream Iconophile armory. Argument (5a) and part of argument (4) are also present in the slightly earlier *Tractatus contra eos qui imagines faciunt* of Epiphanius (see note 50), and argument (5b) is found in the letter of Neilos of Ancyra to Olympiodoros Eparchos, which dates before 430 (see note 51). The second part of argument (4) does not seem to result from knowledge of St. Basil's passage from the *De Spiritu Sancto* (see note 45), but this idea, which seems to appear here for the first time, would have a permanent impact on the Iconophile literature. In this argument are found the rudiments of what Déroche has termed the "théorie générale de la nécessité d'intermédiaires matériels dans une religion sincère."⁸³ Still, Moschos focuses on a different aspect of this relationship, which does not seem to have been seriously adopted later because, among other things, it did not make any distinction—something to be expected from such an early text—between the adoration proper that is (and should be) addressed exclusively to God and veneration of the saints; it also lacked the anagogic concepts introduced into Christian thought by Pseudo-Dionysius.⁸⁴ Moschos' thesis develops as follows: After having explained that it is not the wood or the manmade object that receives the veneration, but the image of the saint on it, Moschos continues with an elaboration on the nature of the saint that procures the legitimacy of his veneration. According to him, a saint is one that has been honored and glorified by God (and to prove this he produces a number of Old Testament quotations). Consequently, our veneration of the saint serves as the human counterpart to God's glorification of him, and this eventually is a form of compliance with the will of God on the part of the Christian. On the other hand, a saint is a servant of God, and any honor paid to the saint passes to the master, that is, to God. Certainly this argument does not prove why the veneration of images should be an accepted form of honoring a saint and not some other form, for example, a commemorative service at the church. The argument lacks the particular subarguments that would establish the image of the saint as a material intermediary between visible and invisible,

⁸²See notes 9–13, 15, 33–36, 40–41, 44–45, 50–51, and 54.

⁸³See Déroche in Leontios of Neapolis, "L'Apologie," 89–90, a detailed analysis of the same argument as it appears in Leontios of Neapolis.

⁸⁴See Kitzinger, "The Cult," 137.

and thus substantiate the icon's relation to its prototype.⁸⁵ Moschos later returns to the subject and offers arguments (5a and b), to which he finally ties the miraculous power of some icons (6).⁸⁶

The last argument brings the dialogue back to the point where the Sabbatian responded that he venerated things that possessed divine power. However, this very argument, which even in this dialogue is presented *sotto voce*, acquired immense importance in later centuries. If one examines the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council that confirmed the legitimacy and veneration of images, it is not difficult to see that many of the texts adduced in favor of image worship and many oral interventions of the participants were concerned with miraculous icons.⁸⁷

For the healing power of relics (and the cult or veneration generated therefrom) there are a number of sources earlier than the fifth century,⁸⁸ but there is no reference to healing icons before the sixth century. A. Grabar traced the origins of the idea of healing icons to the images of saints printed on the phials or medallions from the saints' tombs.⁸⁹ Furthermore, Grabar continued with the concept that it was the association of an icon with a particular relic that gave the icon a derivative supernatural power (the divine power of our text) that enabled it to perform healings. It is remarkable that the wording in the dialogue suggests exactly this order and supports Grabar's theory (βλέπων μάλιστα διὰ τῶν λειψάνων αὐτῶν καὶ χαρακτῆρων θαυματουργίας ἰάσεων γινομένης, lines 115–16).⁹⁰ So, if my dating is correct, the *Dialogue of Moschos* offers the first known attestation of the existence and veneration of miraculous images.

⁸⁵For these arguments see *ibid.*, 92, and cf. *ibid.*, 142.

⁸⁶For the early miraculous images there is no extensive literature, since miracles in general have not yet received particular attention. The most concise treatment of the subject is in A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, II (Paris, 1946), 343–57. H. Belting (*Bild und Kult* [Munich, 1990], 60ff) discusses only miraculously created icons (*acheiropoietai*). Kitzinger ("The Cult," 100–115, esp. 106–7) deals with the post-Justinianic period and thinks that Leontios of Neapolis was the "first author who utilized in an apology of Christian images the claim that they work miracles" (*ibid.*, 147). One other article relevant to the subject is R. Cormack, "Miraculous Icons in Byzantium and Their Powers," *Arte cristiana* 76, fasc. 724 (1988), 55–60, but it revolves around a 9th-century list of miraculous icons. Finally, see also N. Baynes, "The Supernatural Defenders of Constantinople," *AB* 67 (1949), 165–77.

⁸⁷See Mansi XIII, 13BC, 24BC, 24E–32A, and the scholium of Tarasius in 32B, 57D–60B, 64B–65D, 65DE (oral communication of personal experience), 68A–D, 73C–77B, 77C–80B (a set of three stories involving personal experiences), 80D–85C, 85D–89A, 89A–D, 89E–92B, 189E–192C, 193D–196C. For some interesting comments on this reality, see Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, 395–96, and H. G. Beck, *Von der Fragwürdigkeit der Ikone*, SBMünch 7 (Munich, 1975), 26–27.

⁸⁸See Kitzinger, "The Cult," 90.

⁸⁹Grabar, *Martyrium*, II, 344–45.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 346: "Dans tous ces premiers témoignages sur les images miraculeuses vénérées à cause de leur force mystique, c'est l'origine particulière des représentations qui en explique la puissance surnaturelle. Les unes sont liées à la relique (eulogies et colonne de saint Georges), les autres, 'acheiropoietes' ou non, ont été en contact immédiat avec le Christ et la Vierge. L'icone n'est pas encore sainte ni chargée de la grâce divine par elle-même, c'est-à-dire par le simple fait qu'elle reproduit les traits d'un saint personnage, mais parce qu'elle a été, à un moment donné, ou—par l'intermédiaire d'une relique—se trouve en permanence en contact direct avec le Christ ou un saint." However, Kitzinger ("The Cult," 116–19) has indicated that the cult of images, "though clearly prepared and encouraged by the cult of relics, was never entirely dependent on it" and that many images were thought to possess "magic powers" without having been associated with any relic. Obviously, the formulation of our text (and also that of Leontios of Neapolis in note 52 above) is closer to the theory of Grabar, but certainly does not preclude the correctness of Kitzinger's objection, which results from later sources.

From what I have delineated to this point it becomes clear that this dialogue also constitutes the earliest known attempt at a consistent defense of the veneration accorded by Christians to manmade objects (icons included). The arguments presented in the dialogue still lack the refinement and coherence achieved in the course of later confrontations on the subject and the great theological debates of the eighth and ninth centuries. The significance of this text, however, lies, among other things, in the fact that Moschos (or the anonymous author) brought together a number of arguments in favor of image worship that were already in circulation by the end of the fourth century, as I have shown.⁹¹ Though an early text, the *Dialogue of Moschos* does not have much original material to offer as far as Iconophile doctrine is concerned. Evidently Moschos was not the one who transformed, for example, the pagan argument on the commemorative function of an icon introduced by Maximus of Tyrus⁹² into a Christian one. This process was already completed before the fifth century, and if we are to accept the genuineness of the *Tractatus contra eos qui imagines faciunt* of Epiphanius (see note 50), this argument—along with the idea of the honorific character of an icon and its educational function⁹³—must have entered the Christian camp in the fourth century, if not earlier. So Moschos' Iconophile positions represent the beginnings of one of the three tributary streams (the other two being Christology and tradition at large) that, through the anti-Jewish literature of the seventh century, finally merged into the great Iconophile works of the eighth and ninth centuries.

In terms of image worship, the dialogue represents a stage in the development of this practice that seemingly did not extend so far as to include any icons of Christ. One should be cautious, however, in giving full credit to this statement, because it is based on the absence of any reference to the icon of Christ in the surviving fragment of the dialogue. But, along the same line, the time span between the third and the fifth century is a period during which one can single out a number of contradictory testimonies in support of or against image veneration.⁹⁴ Therefore, the most one can say about this dialogue is that it emanates from a milieu that was Iconophile but that probably did not rank Christ among its admitted iconographical themes.⁹⁵

In view of the significance of the dialogue as an early testimony of both image veneration and Iconophile argumentation, I should discuss briefly the gaps that it may fill in the modern literature pertaining to the subject. E. Kitzinger first noted that "there was no really systematic attempt to establish a Christian theory of images prior to the sixth century,"⁹⁶ and then H. G. Thümmel suggested,

War in den Quellen bis in das 6. Jahrhundert hinein nur eine Ablehnung des Bildes zum Ausdruck gekommen, und klang eine Rechtfertigung höchstens in der Anknüpfung an

⁹¹ See above, notes 13, 19, 37, 41–43, 48, 50–51, and 54.

⁹² For the English text, see N. Baynes, "Idolatry and the Early Church," in his *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 132.

⁹³ See also Kitzinger, "The Cult," 136–37.

⁹⁴ See Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 282–316, and A. Grabar, *L'Iconoclisme byzantin: Le dossier archéologique*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1984), 23–25.

⁹⁵ In connection with this, we should note the absence of any reference to *acheiropoietai* in the dialogue. As is well known, stories about *acheiropoietai* appear after the 6th century. See Grabar, *L'Iconoclisme*, 19, 33–40, and Kitzinger, "The Cult," 112–15 and 113 n. 117 for further references.

⁹⁶ Kitzinger, "The Cult," 135.

ein vorhandenes Denkmal an, so ändern sich jetzt die Verhältnisse langsam. Dieser Wandel muß doch wohl so interpretiert werden, daß zunächst das christliche Bild vor allem in einem Bereiche beheimatet war, wo keine Literatur produziert wurde, also in einem eher volkstümlichen Milieu, und daß seit dem 6. Jahrhundert in stärkerem Maße auch theologisch gebildete Kreise das Bild in der Kirche anerkannten und rechtfertigten.⁹⁷

Both also agree that Hypatios of Ephesos was the first theologian to touch on the issue and produce, in the first half of the sixth century, a defense of image worship that is somewhat debatable in its rationale.⁹⁸

From the overall analysis of the *Dialogue of Moschos*, it becomes fairly certain that the defense of the veneration of images had already been undertaken by an unrecognizable monastic milieu that had access to a wealth of biblical sources and some patristic literature almost one century before Hypatios of Ephesos. This defense took its initial shape within the context of the internal confrontations between orthodox Christians and rigorist sectarians of Judaizing tendencies, who opposed the worship of any manmade object.

Sabbatian (and Novatian?) Iconophoby and Other Issues

Disappointingly little is known about the Sabbatians, and one cannot resist the temptation of taking at face value the general assertion that these sectarians hardly differed from the Novatians in terms of dogma. All we can deduce from the dialogue at hand is that they had a number of strong reservations concerning the veneration of manmade objects and created nature. These reservations were based exclusively on the Old Testament prohibition, although it is unclear why the subject was introduced and debated on the basis of the Wisdom of Solomon.⁹⁹ Another interesting aspect of this confrontation is the interpretation of the Old Testament offered by Moschos and eventually accepted by the Sabbatian. In contrast to what had prevailed in the field of scriptural exegesis, allegorical interpretation is used here in only one instance (line 64) in which it is still backed by two additional Old Testament quotations taken in their literal sense (lines 65–66 and 70–71). The other biblical quotations are presented as historical information or as normative texts. Of course, the veneration of manmade objects can be better supported by reference to concrete facts, but this is another characteristic of the dialogue that would have set a precedent for similar discussions in the anti-Jewish works.¹⁰⁰ The constant recourse to the Old Testament is clearly an indication of what the Sabbatians recognized

⁹⁷Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 103.

⁹⁸On this text (Ἰππατίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Ἰουλιανὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ἀτραμυτίου συμμίκτων ζητημάτων βιβλίου α' κεφαλαίου ε', περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις οἴκοις), see Thümmel, *Frühgeschichte*, 103 n. 191, for bibliography. However, the attitude of Hypatios toward icons (which can be summarized as "icons for the illiterate and intellectually inferior, texts for the educated and 'illuminated' ones") was not altogether original in the 6th century. In the Latin *Consultationes Zacchei christiani et Apollonii philosophi* of 408–410, there is a similar rationale behind the defense of image veneration by Zacchaeus (see Feiertag and Steinmann, eds., *Questions*, I:174.8: "Et licet hanc incautoris obsequii consuetudinem [sc. venerationem] districtiores horreant christiani, nec prohibere desinant sacerdotes, non tamen deus dicitur, cuius effigies salutatur, nec adolentur imagines aut colendae aris superstant, sed memoriae pro meritis exponuntur, ut exemplum factorum probabilius posteris praestent aut praesentes pro abusione castigent").

⁹⁹For the early inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon in the Old Testament canon, see Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, XI.7.21–22, ed. K. Mras, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, GCS 43.2 (Berlin, 1956), 21.21–22.

¹⁰⁰For the interpretation of the Old Testament by Christian apologists, see M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, Eng. trans. H. McKeating (Oxford, 1986), 146–55.

as authoritative works in the Christian tradition; on the other hand, the absence of any quotations from approved church fathers may also imply their rejection by the Sabbatians, but this is only a tentative suggestion.¹⁰¹ The issue, however, is important, and I can only make further suggestions without offering any satisfactory explanation. Among other possibilities, one could postulate that the text transmitted by P is a reworked version (perhaps in early Iconoclastic times?) of a document that originally included a number of patristic references. These quotations may have been subsequently removed in order to make the text conform to the standards of anti-Jewish dialogues. The evidence of a number of lacunas in the dialogue leaves some room for this solution, but even this is as hypothetical as my first suggestion. It is interesting, however, that an early-seventh-century Armenian Iconophile treatise does include at least four patristic quotations supporting image veneration.¹⁰² This is the other known pre-Iconoclastic text that offers a disputation on image veneration between Christians and certainly provides a picture different from that of our dialogue.

As for the veneration of manmade objects or created things in general, the Sabbatians become, through the present dialogue, one of the first solidly attested Christian sects to have incorporated iconophobia as part of their devotional practice.¹⁰³ The situation is less clear regarding the veneration of relics. To be sure, we have the testimony of Socrates that the tomb of Sabbatios was a place where his followers offered their prayers¹⁰⁴ until Attikos had his remains exhumed and buried elsewhere.¹⁰⁵ The *Dialogue of Moschos*, however, is confusing on this issue if one focuses on the meaning of each word: Moschos speaks about Sabbatios as the vague recipient of veneration, but he is not clear about his relics (δός μοι τὰ λείψανα Σαββατίου, οὐ σέβη and not ὧν σέβη); thus the question of the veneration of relics by the Sabbatians remains with no definite answer.

Having established that the Sabbatians constituted one of the first declared “Iconoclast” or, at least, non-Iconophile sects of early Christianity, one further point of investigation remains. This is the Novatian attitude toward the veneration of created things, which may be similar to that of the Sabbatians in view of the common ground these two sects share.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the only concrete evidence on this issue comes from a treatise

¹⁰¹In this context it is worth noting that the Novatian (reader and later bishop) Sisinnios was the first to suggest using the testimony of the church fathers in order to solve dogmatic disputes between orthodox Christians and Arians as early as 383 (see Sozomen, *HE*, 314.17–315.26). We do not know whether this movement was the result of the official Novatian stance toward the patristic tradition, or just a tactical move in their fight against the Arians—Sisinnios in any case was very learned in both Scripture and patristic literature—but, judging from this dialogue, it is unlikely that the Sabbatians shared the Novatians’ positive inclination toward patristic tradition.

¹⁰²See Der Nersessian, “Une apologie,” 60–61, 63.

¹⁰³It is difficult, if not impossible, to deduce which segments of Christianity were represented by early non-Iconophiles such as Epiphanius of Salamis or Eusebius of Caesarea.

¹⁰⁴See Socrates, *HE*, PG 67:796A: τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Σαββατίου ἐκ τῆς Ῥόδου μετακομίσαντας . . . καὶ θάψαντας, ἐπὶ τῷ τάφῳ εὐχεσθαι.

¹⁰⁵See above, note 57.

¹⁰⁶Concerning other potentially iconophobic heresies, evidence either does not exist or cannot be verified. There is, for example, a short passage in the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council in which Tarasios lists among the early Iconoclasts the Marcionists, the Manichees (who clearly were not Iconoclasts), and other individuals well known for their Monophysite beliefs (see Mansi XII, 1031DE: Ταράσιος ὁ ἀγιώτατος πατριάρχης εἶπε· εὐρίσκομεν καὶ Μανιχαίους μὴ δεξαμένους εἰκόνας καὶ Μαρκιωνιστάς, καὶ τοὺς συγγητικούς τῶν Χριστοῦ φύσεων, ὧν Πέτρος ὁ Κναφεὺς καὶ Ξεναῖος ὁ Ἱεραπόλεως, οἱ αἵρετικοί, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σεβήρος). The way Tara-

against the Novatians written by Eulogios, patriarch of Alexandria from 580 to 607. In it Eulogios spoke, among other things, of the Novatian aversion to relics and their cult, which practically falls into the category of the veneration of created things. However, this information pertains to some Novatians who lived in Egypt at the beginning of the seventh century, and we cannot be sure whether this was a practice followed by all Novatians or only by those in Alexandria.¹⁰⁷ I present with a strong caveat another potential bit of information on the Novatians because I fear I may be reading too much into the sources: in the Latin *Consultationes Zacchei christiani et Apollonii philosophi*, the Christian informs his discussant that the veneration of images is something that “*districtiores horreant christiani*.”¹⁰⁸ Considering that this is one of the very few texts of this period that display a positive attitude toward the Novatians,¹⁰⁹ I wonder whether the category of “*districtiores christiani*” may include that group.

One later reference to the Novatians, however, is a little more suggestive of a possible connection between the Novatians and iconophobia. The reference comes from the eighth-century *Νουθεσία*, in a passage where the Iconoclast bishop Cosmas enumerated the patristic authorities who had spoken against images. The first author in this list was Epiphanius the wonderworker (of Salamis), followed by George of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch(!). The Iconophile monk retorted by contesting the orthodoxy of the last two authors; as for the iconoclastic writings of Epiphanius, he claimed that they were Novatian forgeries.¹¹⁰ In this context it is evident that, according to the Iconophile monk, the Novatians fabricated a number of iconophobic testimonies. This by implication leads to the conclusion that the Novatians were also Iconoclasts. Unfortunately, it is not possible to establish the credibility of this allusion, and the problem is aggravated by the fact that the author of the *Νουθεσία* probably used our dialogue. So the question becomes

sios expressed his thoughts does not make clear, however, whether iconophobia was a general tenet of those heresies or just a practice observed by some of them or only by the persons mentioned. In any case, according to the *Synodicon Vetus*, and other sources (*Ecclesiastical History* of John Diakrinomenos, Theophanes), the first Iconoclast was one of those mentioned by Tarasios above, that is, the Monophysite Xenaïas of Hierapolis (floruit end of 5th century; see *The Synodicon Vetus* [above, note 71], 90.105.5–9: χειροτονεῖ Ξεναΐαν ἐπίσκοπον . . . τῆς χριστιανοκατηγορικῆς αἱρέσεως ἀρχηγέτην διάπυρον· πρῶτος γὰρ πάντων Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, τῆς πανάγνου αὐτοῦ μητρὸς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τὰς σεβασμίας εἰκόνας τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐξέβαλεν). For more about the other sources and additional bibliography on Xenaïas, see *ibid.*, 91–93 n. 114. For an Iconoclast sect in early-7th-century Armenia, see Der Nersessian, “Une apologie,” 58–87, and P. Alexander, “An Ascetic Sect of Iconoclasts in Seventh Century Armenia,” in K. Weitzmann, ed., *Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend Jr.* (Princeton, N.J., 1955), 151–60. Finally, for the possible connections between Paulicianism and Byzantine Iconoclasm, see N. G. Garsoïan, “Byzantine Heresy: A Reinterpretation,” *DOP* 25 (1971), 97–101.

¹⁰⁷The treatise of Eulogios has not been preserved. All we have is an extensive description of it in the *Bibliotheca* of Photios (see cod. 182 = vol. II, pp. 193–94 and cod. 280 = vol. VIII, pp. 209–11). Even Photios is not sure about the extent of this Novatian practice (see cod. 182, pp. 193–94: Ἐν δὲ τῷ πέμπτῳ <λόγῳ> ἰδίως περὶ τοῦ δεῖν τιμᾶν τὰ τῶν μαρτύρων λείψανα ἐπαγωνίζεται [sc. Eulogios], ὃ μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι πράττειν φησὶ τοὺς ἀνὰ τὴν Ἀλεξανδρείαν διασπαρέντας Ναυατιανούς, εἴτε τούτων μόνων καὶ τὴν τοιαύτην νόσον προσ- νενοσηκότων, εἴτε κοινῶς τῆς αἱρέσεως τοῦτο διαπρεσβευσούσης).

¹⁰⁸See above, note 98.

¹⁰⁹See Feiertag and Steinmann, eds., *Questions*, II:129.

¹¹⁰See *Νουθεσία*, 179–80: Ὁ γέρων· περὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἐπιφανίου ψευδεπιλάστως αὐτοῦ χρᾶσαι· Ναυατια- νοὶ γάρ, σπεύσαντες τὰ εὐλογα τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν στήσαι, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοφόρου κεφαλὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐχρήσαντο. See also S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Constantine V*, CSCO, Subsidia 52 (Louvain, 1977), 34.

more complex: was the author of the *Novθεσία* aware of some things about the Novatians that we do not know? Was he confusing them with the Sabbatians of our dialogue? It is impossible to answer. Unfortunately, this is all that the extant sources can offer for the time being, and it is rather inconclusive.

Concerning the Sabbatians, however, it is reasonable to assume that their iconophobia was part of their Judaizing character which, I would suggest, manifested itself in, among other things, the strict observance of Old Testament precepts.¹¹¹ Along the same lines, one could cite their preference for celebrating Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover. Certainly, the Jewish origins of Sabbatians might have accounted for other Judaizing practices adopted by his followers, but I am unable to describe any of them, if there were any. Rather odd, however, is the possible veneration of the relic of Sabbatians, because this kind of veneration is something quite alien to Jewish customs. In the later sources one can find more examples of other Judaizing practices observed by the Sabbatians or other related sects, such as the Quartodecimans;¹¹² it is very difficult, however, to establish that a certain ninth-century Sabbatian, for example, who followed the Mosaic law and rejected both the Resurrection of Christ and the existence of the devil¹¹³ was the direct descendant of our Sabbatian.¹¹⁴

On the other hand, it seems that it was the identity of the Sabbatian interlocutor of Moschos that may have been responsible for the form and the content of the dialogue and its eventual resemblance to later anti-Jewish dialogues. In other words, Moschos was not in a much different position talking to the Sabbatian, than, say, Leontios addressing his imaginary Jew because of the similarity of the subject and of a number of possible analogies between Sabbatians and Jews that I have presented above.

To conclude, the present dialogue helps to locate with more precision one of the most important sources of iconophobic attitudes within the early Christian Church.¹¹⁵ This source was the Judaizing sect of Sabbatians and possibly some segments of the Novatian Church. This should not be surprising; one would expect to find in the Judaizing sects the most fertile ground for a continuation of the Old Testament hostility to any artistic representation. This is exactly the inspiration for the position of the early Iconoclasts before Constantine V, which is why the Iconoclastic arguments of Leo III are the same as those of the Sabbatian.¹¹⁶ However, the *Dialogue of Moschos* shows that, apart from some individual exceptions of early fathers such as Epiphanius of Salamis, the mainstream

¹¹¹For the meaning of Judaizing and other related issues, see G. Dagron, "Judaïser," *TM* 11 (1991), 359–80.

¹¹²For a well-attested conversion of Quartodecimans to orthodoxy, see C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), 279ff.

¹¹³The Sabbatian(?) in question was in fact the Iconoclast emperor Michael II; see *Vita Ignatii*, PG 105:493c; for more see Dagron, "Judaïser," 367, and Gouillard, "L'hérésie" (above, note 2), 310–11. It is very likely that the term is used in this case as a slander.

¹¹⁴On Judaizing heresies and iconophobia, see P. Crone, "Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 2 (1980), 83ff. It is worth noting that, apart from our Sabbatians, there was already in existence another Judeo-Christian sect of the same name. According to Syrian authors, the sect originated in Apostolic times (*ibid.*, 84). I wish to thank S. Shoemaker for this reference.

¹¹⁵For more on the subject and further bibliography on other possible sources of iconophobia in the early Church, see Murray, "Art and the Early Church," 303–4 nn. 1–2.

¹¹⁶In addition to the bibliography cited above (notes 80–81), see also Th. Sideris, "The Theological Arguments of the Iconoclasts during the Iconoclastic Controversy," *ByzSt* 6.1–2 (1979), 178–91, esp. 181–83.

Church was not openly and unanimously hostile to the veneration of manmade objects.¹¹⁷ The initially quasi-internal and subsequently marginal pressure from rigorist sects must have turned the attention of the early Church to the problem of image veneration.¹¹⁸

The Dialogue and Later Works

As indicated in the introduction, Gouillard first thought that this work, being a ninth-century product, had borrowed some passages from the letter of Pope Gregory II to Patriarch Germanus.¹¹⁹ I hope that the analysis provided here has proven the impossibility of such an assumption. In addition, I add a few more arguments in support of the priority of our dialogue over the letter of Pope Gregory II. The passage from Gregory's letter reads as follows in P (fol. 283):

. . . οὐδὲ γὰρ δαμάλεις προσεκυνήσαμεν, οὐδὲ μόσχον ἐν Χωρήβ ἐχαλκεύσαμεν, οὔτε Θεὸς ἡμῖν ἢ κτίσις λελόγισται, οὐδ' αὖ πάλιν τῷ γλυπτῷ ὑπεπέσαμεν καὶ τῷ Βεελφεγὼρ ἐτελέσθημεν, οὐδὲ τεκνοφόνους τελετὰς [τελετὰς] ἢ κρίφια μυστήρια ἐτελέσαμεν, οὐδὲ τοὺς υἱοὺς ἡμῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ἡμῶν ἐθύσαμεν δαιμονίοις ποτέ, ὥς ἂν εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ παρὰ Σολομῶντος τοῖς εἰδωλολάτραις λεγόμενα ἐκλαμβάνεσθαι. Μὴ γὰρ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἐφονοκτονήθη ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς αἵμασιν ἢ εἰκόνα εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἐποιήσαμεν τετράμορφον ἔχουσαν εἶδωλον καὶ ταύτη προσεκυνήσαμεν; Μὴ βδέλυγμα ἐρπετῶν καὶ κτηνῶν ἐπὶ τῷ τοίχῳ τοῦ ναοῦ κατεγράψαμεν; Ἡ πάλιν ἡμᾶς ὁ Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἐθεάσατο θρηνοῦντας τὸν Ἀδὸν καὶ θυμιῶντας τῷ ἡλίῳ; Περὶ ὧν φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα; Μὴ ἄρα ἐστήσαμεν εἰκόνας τῶν δύο πορνῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, τῆς Ὀλοδοᾶ καὶ τῆς Ὀλίβα καὶ ταῦτα προσεκυνήσαμεν, ἢ αὐτοῖς θυσίαι παρ' ἡμῶν τῷ Βῆλ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι καὶ τῷ Δαγῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ προσηνέχθησαν ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ὑπεπέσαμεν; Οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστι . . .

A comparison between this fragment and the text included in lines 25–43 of the dialogue will easily show that the text of the dialogue is more extensive and complete than the fragment in Gregory's letter. Compare the following:

(1) Dialogue, lines 27–29: *Wisd. of Sol.* 14.8–9/12 where the phrase τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν Θεὸς ὀνομάσθη occurs.

Gregory's letter, lines 1–2: οὔτε Θεὸς ἡμῖν ἢ κτίσις λελόγισται.

(2) Dialogue, lines 32–35: *Wisd. of Sol.* 14.22–23.

Gregory's letter, lines 4–5: ὥς ἂν εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ παρὰ Σολομῶντος τοῖς εἰδωλολάτραις λεγόμενα ἐκλαμβάνεσθαι.

Of course, the two versions come closer in the remaining lines that follow the words Μὴ γὰρ . . . ἐφονοκτονήθη, but it is still difficult to accept that the dialogue copies the letter of Gregory. In practice it is much easier to abridge an existing text than to identify and cite in full a biblical passage that is alluded to. The first line of the passage in the letter of Gregory where there is a reference to the worship of cows (οὐδὲ γὰρ δαμάλεις προσεκυνήσαμεν) must be an addition by the author of the letter. This allusion comes from 1 Kings 12.28 and disturbs the “chronological” sequence of the events cited in the

¹¹⁷For a reevaluation of this theory, see Murray, “Art and the Early Church,” 305ff.

¹¹⁸For a similar conclusion, put, however, in a much wider frame, see Crone, “Islam,” 74ff.

¹¹⁹See Gouillard, “Aux origines” (above, note 3), 244–53. For an exhaustive bibliography and discussion of this letter, see P. Conte, *Regesto delle lettere dei papi del secolo VIII. Saggi* (Milan, 1984), 46ff.

sequel. A further addition, I think, is the short sentence with which the fragment from Gregory ends (ἡ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ὑπεπέσαμεν;). Besides, in the letter of Gregory there are a number of Iconophile *testimonia* taken from earlier works, all of which have been identified by Gouillard.¹²⁰ The fragment from the dialogue is the only piece for which Gouillard is rather vague and considers it a borrowing from anti-Jewish literature.¹²¹ But why should one go that far, when the source in question was already available in the form of the *Dialogue of Moschos* some time before the introduction of the subject in the anti-Jewish texts?

The second author that, in all probability, used the dialogue was a certain Theosebes who wrote the *Νουθεσία γέροντος* before 775. Here the borrowings are not direct, but knowledge and creative reuse of ideas found in the dialogue are evident in some parts of the *Νουθεσία*. It has already been pointed out that some biblical quotations are shared only by the dialogue and the *Νουθεσία*.¹²² A basic feature of the *Νουθεσία* is that it repeats many of the Iconophile arguments of the *Dialogue of Moschos*, but the *Νουθεσία* is more advanced than the dialogue in that the verbal exchanges between the Iconophile monk and the Iconoclast bishop Cosmas are more balanced, the Old Testament citations more extensive and complete, and the arguments more appropriately articulated. I list here some parallels between the dialogue (D) and the *Νουθεσία* (N) without trying to be exhaustive.¹²³ Compare the following:

(1) D lines 58–63 = Ps. 113.12–16

N lines 186–88 = Ps. 113.12–13 (adding καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς)

(2) D lines 43–47: Ταῦτα ἐκεῖνοις τοῖς ποιήσασιν ἐγκαλεῖ· ταῦτα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις λέγει, περὶ ὧν καὶ ἡ γραφὴ μεγαλοφώνως βοᾷ· ποῦ γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ Σολομῶντος ἡ Χριστιανῶν ἐκκλησία; Οὐδὲ μετὰ χίλια ἔτη ἀνέστη ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα γέγονε καὶ ἐλέχθη. Πῶς οὖν ταῦτα τῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγκαλεῖς ἐκκλησίᾳ, τῇ μηδέποτε εἰδώλοις τελεσθεῖσιν . . .

N lines 205–11: Ὁ γέρων εἶπεν· ὅτε ταῦτα Μωσῆς ἀπεφώνησεν, ὁ χριστιανισμὸς ἢ τὰ Χριστοῦ ἐντάλματα καὶ αἱ ἅγαι αὐτοῦ παραδόσεις ἐπὶ γῆς ἐπολιτεύοντο; Ναὶ ἢ οὐ; Κοσμάς εἶπεν· οὐδὲ μετὰ τρισχίλια ἔτη ἦλθεν ἐν σαρκὶ Χριστὸς ἐπὶ γῆς . . .

(3) D lines 72–74: Εἰπὲ οὖν, πῶς προσκυνεῖς τῇ κοινωνίᾳ σου καὶ τῷ μεγαλείῳ σου—καὶ ταῦτα χειροποίητα κατασκευάσματα—καὶ ταῦτα πῶς προσκυνεῖς;

N lines 379–83: Ὁ γέρων εἶπεν· ἰδοὺ τὴν μαρτυρίαν κατὰ σεαυτὸν φέρων οὐ νοεῖς· εἰρηκῶς γὰρ “τὸ χειροποίητον, ἐπικατάρατον αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ ποιήσας αὐτό,” τί λέγεις; Ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ χειροποίητός ἐστιν ἢ οὐ; Τὰ ἅγια εὐαγγέλια καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ σκεύη τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τὰ ἅγια δῶρα οὐκ εἰσιν χειροποίητα;

The last example is apparently a list of clichés that occur throughout the entire Iconophile and anti-Jewish literature. However, as far as I know, the elements of the Holy

¹²⁰For these *testimonia*, see Gouillard, “Aux origines,” 246–47.

¹²¹Ibid., 247: “Une meilleure connaissance des écrits polémiques contre les Juifs montrerait certainement que Grégoire leur doit bien davantage. Sinon la bizarre leçon Olodam, . . . peut-être accidentelle, l’allusion à ‘l’idole tétramorphe’ de Manassé . . . reflètent les à-peu-près outranciers d’un polémiste populaire.” However, as I have shown above, no known anti-Jewish text provides anything similar to this passage.

¹²²See above, notes 9 and 10, esp. the latter.

¹²³I will return to this issue in the critical edition of the *Νουθεσία* on which I am currently working.

Eucharist are listed among the created objects that are worshiped only by these two works and by the *Adversus Iconoclastas*,¹²⁴ which was written in 770.¹²⁵

John of Damascus and the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Nicaea 787) undoubtedly ignored the *Dialogue of Moschos*, and one might wonder if either John of Damascus or Patriarch Tarasios ever came across this text. For John of Damascus the answer is easy: had he known the *Dialogue of Moschos*, he would have included it in one of his three Iconophile florilegia. For Tarasios and his assistants the answer is more complicated: it is characteristic that the first part of the fifth session at Nicaea was devoted to discussing the origins of Iconoclasm. Tarasios presented a number of texts, arguing that, apart from the Old Testament example of Nebuchadnezzar who destroyed the Cherubim,¹²⁶ the Iconoclasts were Samaritans,¹²⁷ pagans (Greeks),¹²⁸ Jews,¹²⁹ Manichees or Phantasiasts,¹³⁰ and the Monophysites Xenaïas of Hierapolis and Severus of Antioch.¹³¹ This is all Tarasios was able to come up with. Moreover, a careful investigation of the text of the acts of Nicaea has failed to produce any textual parallels with the *Dialogue of Moschos*. However, as I have argued elsewhere,¹³² the archetype of P, which included the dialogue, was a manuscript from the papal library in Rome, and the Seventh Ecumenical Council made use of this manuscript. The reasons why this text was ignored by Tarasios are not clear to me, but one can assume that the work of Leontios of Neapolis against the Jews was sufficient for the needs of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (in this respect, compare Tarasios with the case of Nicephorus below). In any event, by that time the Sabbatians would have been long forgotten in Constantinople or, more likely, they were a negligible entity.

Despite its absence from the acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, the *Dialogue of Moschos* was available in Constantinople after 787, as stated above. This is confirmed by the following passage from the recently published *Refutatio et eversio* of Patriarch Nicephorus. In order to refute an Iconoclastic *testimonium* presented at the Council of St. Sophia (815) under the name of a certain Leontios, Nicephorus cited some fragments from the dialogue of Leontios of Neapolis. In the sequel he stated that he could also quote from other authors who had written against Jews, pagans, and other heretics, but he did not wish to shoot wide of his mark, so he only gave the names of these authors. The relevant extract from the *Refutatio et eversio* reads as follows:

. . . ἐώμεν δὲ τανῶν λέγειν ὥστε μὴ ἐν παρεκβάσει τοῦ προκειμένου σκοποῦ γενέσθαι, οἷα καὶ ὅσα πρὸς Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἑλλήνας καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλη ἀντίθετος τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου μοῖρα καὶ ἕτεροι ἱεροὶ ἄνδρες τῆς εὐσεβείας προμαχησάμενοι ἀντεῖπον· Ἀναστάσιός τε ὁ θεοφιλῆς, ὁ κατὰ τὸ Σιναῖον ὄρος, ἥτοι τῆς Ἀντιοχείων προεδρεύσας καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ τῆς Θεσσαλονικέων

¹²⁴ PG 96:505A.

¹²⁵ See H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 488.

¹²⁶ Mansi XIII, 160AB.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 160D–164B.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 164C–165D, 185A–188B.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 165E–168C.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 168D–173D.

¹³¹ Ibid., 180D–184C.

¹³² See Alexakis, “Some Remarks,” 143 (above, note 58); idem, *Codex Parisinus*, 254–57.

ἐπιτροπεύσας ἀρχιερωσύνης, Σέργιος τε καὶ Μόσχος, οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι καὶ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ θεοσεβέστατος διάκονος καὶ χαρτοφύλαξ τῆς μεγάλης κατὰ τὴν βασιλεύουσαν ἐκκλησίας γνωρισθεῖς· ὧν οἱ λόγοι ὅποιοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τίνων τοῖς φιλοπόνως ἐκζητοῦσιν ἐμφανεῖς καθίστανται.¹³³

As noted earlier, these authors did indeed write against Jews (Anastasius Sinaites) or pagans (John of Thessalonica and Constantine the deacon and chartophylax). Sergios cannot be identified,¹³⁴ but Moschos must be the “recluse” of our dialogue, since the famous John Moschos is well known for his *Pratum spirituale* and practically for nothing else (see CPG 7376 and 7377). The above passage is the only known witness to the existence of a Moschos who wrote against Jews, pagans, or heretics, but we are on the safe side assuming that Nicephorus listed Moschos as an author of antiheretical work(s?), since all the other categories were covered by the remaining names. In this context the extract from Nicephorus offers an additional argument in favor of the dialogue’s early date. It also lends some support to my suggestion that Moschos was ignored by Tarasios because the work of Leontios of Neapolis was sufficient for the needs of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Facing the same situation, Nicephorus did exactly what Tarasios had done about thirty years previously, but Nicephorus, at least, stated the reasons behind his decision and gave the names of the authors he decided to omit.¹³⁵

Columbia University and Dumbarton Oaks

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

A. The Bible

For the Old Testament text I used the *Septuaginta* edition by A. Rahlfs (Athens, 1979). On some occasions I also consulted the edition published by the Academy of Göttingen (see below, *Septuaginta Göttingensis*). For the New Testament I relied on the 1987 reprint of the Nestle-Aland edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart, 1979).

For the translation of the biblical passages I used the King James Version, supplemented by the translation of Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha, Greek and English* (London, 1851; repr. 1987). However, the translations of the Wisdom of Solomon are from R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, I: *Apocrypha* (Oxford, 1913).

For the Talmud I used the *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*, published under the editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein (London, 1978).

¹³³J. M. Featherstone, ed., *Nicephori Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Refutatio et eversio definitionis synodalis anni 815*, CCSG 33 (Louvain, 1997), 174; see also Alexander, *Nicephorus*, 257 for an English summary.

¹³⁴Sergios the Stylite of the Syrian disputation is rather late to be identified with this one. In Nicephorus’ text, Sergios and Moschos appear to be somehow connected in this passage. Does this imply that Nicephorus had a more complete version of this text in which Sergios was an ally of Moschos in the dialogue?

¹³⁵I have left for further investigation an issue dealing with the provenance of some inexact references to the Old Testament. It would be of interest to ascertain the source of many of the (supposedly) Old Testament quotations in the entire corpus of Byzantine literature. All the critical editions to date have contented themselves with a citation of an Old Testament reference preceded by “cf.” or followed by a question mark. Numerous surprises may be in store for a researcher who investigates the extra-testamental sources of Hebrew literature. Many questions concerning the mutual influences between Christianity and Judaism in the early Christian centuries may find new answers.

B. Other Primary Sources

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*: J. C. Rolfe, ed., *Ammiani Marcellini, Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, II, Loeb ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).
- Ἀντιβολή: Ἀντιβολή Παπίσκου καὶ Φίλωνος Ἰουδαίων, ed. A. C. McGiffert, *Dialogue between a Christian and a Jew* (New York, 1889) (CPG 7796).
- Disputation of Sergius*: A. P. Hayman, ed., *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew*, CSCO, *Scriptores Syri* 152–53 (Louvain, 1973).
- Epiphanius, *Panarion*: K. Holl, ed., *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)*, 3 vols., GCS 25, 31, 37 (Leipzig, 1915, 1922; Berlin, 1985) (CPG 3745).
- Eusebius, *VC: Vita Constantini*, ed. I. A. Heikel, *Eusebius Werke, erster Band über das Leben Constantins etc.*, GCS 7 (Leipzig, 1902) (CPG 3496).
- Hönscheid, *Didymus*: J. Hönscheid, ed., *Didymus der Blinde, De Trinitate*, I (Meisenheim am Glan, 1975) (CPG 2570).
- John of Damascus, *Schriften III*: B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, III: Contra imaginum calumniatores orationes tres*, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 17 (Berlin-New York, 1975) (CPG 8045).
- John of Damascus, *Schriften IV*: B. Kotter, ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos, IV: Liber de haeresibus. Opera polemica*, *Patristische Texte und Studien* 22 (Berlin-New York, 1981).
- Leontios of Neapolis, “L’Apologie”: V. Déroche, ed., “L’Apologie contre les Juifs de Leontios de Néapolis,” *TM* 12 (1994), 45–104, text and French translation at 61–85 (CPG 7885).
- Νουθεσία: Νουθεσία γέροντος περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων, ed. A. Misides, Ἡ παρουσία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Κύπρου εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰκόνων (Γεώργιος ὁ Κύπριος καὶ Κωνσταντῖνος Κωνσταντίας) (Nicosia, 1989), text at 153–92.
- Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικά: A. Cameron and J. Herrin, eds., *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* (Leiden, 1984).
- Photios, *Bibliotheca*: R. Henry, ed., *Photius Bibliothèque*, 8 vols. (Paris, 1959–77).
- Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio*: Ps.-Anastasius, *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos*, PG 89:1204–81 (CPG 7772).
- Septuaginta Gottingensis: Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum*, ed. R. Hanhart, J. W. Wevers, A. Rahlfs, et al. (Göttingen, 1931ff).
- Socrates, *HE*: Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG 67:28–842 (CPG 6082).
- Sozomen, *HE*: Sozomenus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*, GCS 50 (Berlin, 1960) (CPG 6030).
- Stephen of Bostra, *Contra Iudaeos*: A. Alexakis, ed., “Stephen of Bostra: Fragmenta contra Iudaeos (CPG 7790),” *JÖB* 43 (1993), 45–60, text at 51–56.
- Theodoret, *HE*: Theodoretus Cyrri, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler, *Theodoret, Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed., GCS 54 (Berlin, 1954) (CPG 6222).
- Τρόπαια: *Trophaea Damasci. Dialogus contra Iudaeos*, ed. G. Bardy, *Les Trophées de Damas: Controverse judéo-chrétienne du VIIe siècle*, PO 15 (1927), 173–275 (CPG 7797).